University of Alberta

Navigating Discourse: Structure, Form, and Genre in Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*

by

Jan Kristian Olesen ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

English and Film Studies

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2007

Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-33041-8
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-33041-8

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my mother and father. You two have supported me in all of my endeavors, no matter how crazy or strange. This project began not long after dad's death, but somehow I feel as though he has always been present in this work.

Abstract

This dissertation focuses on early modern English travel literature's contribution to ontological, historical, and textual production. I have focused on Richard Hakluyt's compilation *The Principal Navigations of the English Nation*, examining it within its early modern context as a provocative site for the development of contemporary textual scholarship and theory.

I argue that *Navigations* is a formal and rhetorical double agent; that it participates in the chronicle tradition out of which it grows, but exceeds these boundaries in form and structure. Richard Hakluyt develops historical writing by destabilizing the two traditional opposing poles of textual authority: experience and theory. Including contradictory first person accounts along with suspicious and at times blatantly erroneous theoretical extrapolation, Hakluyt undermines the essentialist demand for stable textual representation of external reality. Juxtaposing standard travel narratives with poems, ships' charts, and fictional dialogue, I argue that *Navigations* reshapes textual authority, asking history to be poetical and poetry to be historical: multiple media diversifies while it destabilizes historical narrative.

There are two major case studies in this work, one of Anthony Jenkinson's voyages to Russia and the other of Martin Frobisher's voyages in search of a northwest passage. I argue that Jenkinson's troubles with the Tsar Ivan underscore the communicative disparities that arise from disparate social, mercantile, and economic systems, and

emphasize how communication is mediated through social constructs other than language. Martin Frobisher's texts allow me to dramatize the inconsistencies of first person accounts, and problematize the stylistic, experiential, and linguistic play in narrative proper.

I then move to an investigation of the printed marginalia within *Navigations,* arguing that it indicates multiple moments of editorial intervention which in turn facilitate multiple reading practices. The breadth of cross-references in *Navigations* and the fact that Hakluyt endeavours to include the original side notes indicates a complex dialogue underway within early modern travel literature, and simultaneously reveals the multiple participants in each single perspective and text.

Acknowledgements

Over the course of this project I have been supported by a number of institutions and people. I would like to thank John Considine first and foremost. His support, patience, and focus were invaluable to the project and to my growth as an academic. I would also like to thank Garrett Epp, Mark Simpson for their interest and support from the earliest moments of this project. Michael O'Driscoll, Mary Fuller and Jane Samson also deserve my warm thanks as conscientious, thorough, and fair examiners. The graduate environment was particularly rich for me, and I would like to thank Gaby Zezulka-Mailloux, Adam Dickinson, Andy Weaver, Karen Engel, Monica Flegel, Carmen Ellison, Michael Epp, Theo Finnigan, and Roger Davis. The intellectual conversations and debate that was a part of student life was invaluable to my intellectual growth.

Finally, I would like to thank my immediate family, Sten, Tricia, Matias, Siri, Steve, Aubry, Kai, and, of course, my mother. The Nostbakken clan has also been wonderfully supportive. In many respects, my interest in learning has its Genesis in the early discussion I observed between my uncles and aunts.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Getting Started 1

Intervention 7

The Project 12

Chapter I

What God Hath Wrot: Historicity in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* 16

The Writing of History 18

What is Hakluyt Doing with texts? 47

Editorial Influence 51

Chapter II

The General Desire of the Realm: Who Reads Hakluyt and How? 67

Hakluyt as English Desire 78

Is History Art? 88

Poetry's Fainting Pen 93

Chapter III

Study of the case: what does discovery discover. 108

Anthony Jenkinson, History in the Margins 109

Orchestrating repetition, Three Travelers 127

Chapter IV

The Shifting Space of the Text: The Shifting Pace of the Academy 155

Scholarship of the Text 156

Marginal Navigation 170

The Source of Navigations 186

Works Cited 194

Introduction, Getting Started

In the examination process that necessarily precedes the writing of a dissertation, the standard question, "explain why you have chosen this field of study," was presented to me with a subtle wrinkle. Because previous proposals of mine had included foreign travel narratives, the question was altered to ask why I had selected Richard Hakluyt's *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation* as my primary text, and not the many foreign narratives that earlier in my work appeared so very important. I did not answer this question in the written exams and, as no one picked it up in the oral defence, it has remained unanswered. While contemplating what questions to write on during the exam, I dismissed the question as a matter of disciplinary borders; someone attempting to complete a degree in English can not have texts written in languages other than English as their primary focus. An English degree should investigate texts that are, at the very least, initially written in English. My answer, if I had given one, would have been short and sour: "I'm not doing foreign travel narratives because you won't let me."

It was what I saw as an unmediated experience with the unknown and the subsequent struggle to understand and know that initially drew me to early modern contact narratives. It seemed reasonable to me that the discovery of a previously unknown continent would be fertile ground for investigations into how people attempt to understand each other on a fundamental level, and how this understanding is represented. How would people attempt to communicate with previously unknown people? What forms would this communication take, and how would people understand cultural differences? Further, how would people come to understand the geography, flora, and fauna of the new world, and how would chroniclers of this new world make it intelligible to those who had not experienced it? While much study has been devoted to the question of colonization of the new world, my interest lay slightly to one side of this concern, with the moments where colonial interests or desire run aground on unknowing, the moments where representation breaks down. To locate the moments of confusion or wonder is to locate moments where the colonial project is temporarily suspended, moments that make present a real attempt to understand, free from ideological bias or political investment.

This interest set me on a path to discover the first contact narrative, the seminal moment of discovery, which proved much more difficult than I initially expected. My assumption was that the earlier narratives would present a more accurate, raw, and immediate reaction towards the unknown, of wonder at the gap in knowledge (a Baconian philosophy without knowing it). I quickly discovered that what is usually understood as the first contact narrative with the new world, the first voyage of Christopher Columbus, was contested, if somewhat questionably, by several other accounts, and that first contact happens in many different times and places. More importantly, I discovered that my assumption that these narratives would present explorers grappling with the magnitude of their discovery was wrong. The earliest experiences with the new world were often too fresh, too immediate, to evoke the response I was looking for. The discoverer's expectations, with a few hiccoughs here and there, simply reduced the discovery of the new world to known ontology. Even early communication between Europeans and indigenous peoples is presented as nearly seamless. Christopher Columbus reads the native reaction to the cross as an implicit understanding of its iconographic importance.

When encountering indigenous people for the first time, the bow from the native leader, with his arms spread wide, is read as a gesture of submission and an offering up of the land to European interest (Columbus 39-70). This is, of course, the initial experience of Columbus and the reason why indigenous North American people become Indians. It took time for people to discover that Cuba was in fact not India, and still more time after this to discover that India and a northwest passage did not lie close by. The discovery that there was some other land behind Cuba, and just how significant that land was, was made by John Cabot in 1497 and is included in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* (Hakluyt 1600, 4-10).[1] The quest for a northwest passage, on the other hand, was a much more messy affair. The furthest north any Englishman got during Hakluyt's publishing time was John Davis in 1586.

The notion that there was a significant amount of material discussing English travel and encounter was good news for someone confined to working with English texts. So I set off to see what English travel had in store, and what English travel accomplished. While most travel texts register some degree of discovery and experience with the unknown, it is often muted, partially expected, or even pre-determined. The variety of early modern voyages shows a wide scope of purpose. Voyages like the 'grand tour,' something that by the middle of the seventeenth century would become a standard practice for wealthy men, were voyages of education, rights of passage for youth to discover and experience social and cultural diversity. This sort of voyage was not common in the sixteenth century, although there were some, most notably Philip Sidney, who made the trip (Robinson viii-xxvi). Likewise, pilgrimages were processes of discovery designed to solidify an ontology of faith, a voyage to discover some eternal and ever present truth. Neither of these genres of travel narrative was interested in forging a new knowledge; these narratives described an experience that solidified something that was known to exist and had always existed, were processes of realizing a particular social or personal self-definition. With the discovery of the new world, the European 'old-world' traveller was, eventually, confronted with the possibility that former fact was either fiction or at least not the whole truth.

---

[1] Hakluyt erroneously dates the voyage at 1496.

My primary interest was to find narratives that investigated the problem of communication and representation, narratives in which the writer is able to recognize that the new world really was a new world, different from any old world expectation. The most obvious source of early modern English travel narratives is Richard Hakluyt and Richard Eden. Discovering that Eden was primarily a translator of foreign narratives, putting me close to square one, I looked to Hakluyt's *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation* for a few leads. Like most people who look into Hakluyt's book, I was more interested in using the text as an archive, as a springboard to new research, rather than as a primary source. However, after discovering that the paper trail Hakluyt left behind is at worst non-existent and at best rather disorganized – according to Anthony Payne, Hakluyt destroyed all of the manuscripts he reprinted and what was left after his death was horribly mixed up by Samuel Purchas, so much so that a bibliographical or editorial thesis seemed to be the most important task (Payne, "travel books of Richard Hakluyt" 1-37) – and experiencing how favourably senior members of the faculty reacted when I suggested I just might read the whole of *The Principal Navigations*, I decided to take the plunge.

I soon realized that *The Principal Navigations* contained the precise narratives I was interested in as well as many other elements of discovery I had previously not considered. Not only is there a wealth of narrative about the discovery of the new world, but the philosophical concepts I initially thought best represented in early contact narratives were in fact present in early voyages to Russia, Persia, Africa, and even Norway. I also discovered that the problem of having Hakluyt as my primary source, a collector of narratives and not himself a traveller, was not limiting but liberating. Using Hakluyt allowed me to look at a wealth of different narratives that would have made for a much messier presentation had he not arranged them, and presented opportunities to examine questions of textual form and archive in interesting ways. Hakluyt was also working in a historical medium that had many undefined discursive boundaries. This is precisely the moment of distance I was looking for, a distance that highlights the question of representation. Hakluyt, I found out, in re-presenting narratives of discovery, needed to grapple with the problems of 'otherness' as much as the travellers did, and his technique for composing a history of English travel similarly needed to discover ways of adequately and accurately representing discovery.

The primary material for this project was the second edition of Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, published in three volumes in 1598, 1599, and 1600. Hakluyt published an earlier, much shorter edition in 1589. Initially I worked through J. M. Dent's ten-volume edition published in 1927, which contains the introductions and dedications from both the first and second editions. Once I made the decision to work with Hakluyt exclusively, I used the *Early English Books Online database*, which contains a full-text version of the

Huntington Library's copy of the second edition of *Navigations*. For all of the in-text citations from the second edition of *Navigations*, I cut and pasted from *Early English Books Online.* In the absence of a modern critical edition, the electronic version became my primary text, complete with its variant spellings. In the course of researching the primary material for this project I had a chance to look at the *Diverse Voyages* – a collection that can be seen as a precursor to *Navigations* – *Discourse of Western Planting, Virginia Richly Valued,* and the 1589 edition of *Navigations*. While I have made reference to each of these texts, and I used the dedications and introductions from the first edition of *Navigations*, their use is designed to provide context for the second edition. The special collections library at the University of Alberta holds an original copy of the first edition of *Navigations,* which I consulted, but any other text of Hakluyt I consulted through the *Early English Books Online* database. The database indicates that the 1598 and 1599 editions are bound in one volume, and that the second edition has two sections that are differently paginated. I will distinguish *Principal Navigations* through a reference to edition, year of publication, and section when necessary.

My focus on the second edition of *Navigations* was initially accidental. It was simply the first text I discovered of Hakluyt. Once I discovered an earlier edition existed, and that Hakluyt was involved in several other projects, the decision to use the second edition came from both a bloody-mindedness – how could I read this much travel literature and not make it the focus of my work – and what I perceived to be an interesting critical intervention. The first edition is much shorter than the second – it is less than half the size – and there are interesting changes between the two editions. Hakluyt excises the sections on Mandevill, André Thevet, and a narrative from Thomas

Ingram. There are other changes in selection as well, as Hakluyt appears to be working towards a text with materially stable truth claims. There are still questions of stability in the second edition as well, however, as Hakluyt does include several texts with references to magical creatures such as Blemmyans and Unicorns (below 29).

Intervention

There are two significant absences in the scholarly work on Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*. One is a disciplinary absence – that most Hakluyt study is confined to history and not English departments – and the other is a reluctance of scholars in any field to discuss *Principal Navigations* as a completed text rather than some kind of resource catalogue. While there is an obvious historical value in *Navigations*, the debate about just what sort of contribution Hakluyt makes to the history of English travel has been a contentious one (Pennington 576-610). While initial historical studies have relied on *Navigations* as a valuable and accurate compendium of English travel, as early as the mid-eighteenth century, critics began to question the accuracy of Hakluyt's texts, questions that had implications far outside of the academy. In the process of diplomatic dealings between France and England, England claimed possession of North America based on the Cabot voyages included in *Navigations*. In the mid-seventeenth century, England and France were in the midst of a diplomatic war over claims to North America. England's argument with France hinged upon the accuracy of the Cabot voyages included in *Navigations*, and France, in opposing England's claim, chose the textual field as its battleground (Pennington 578). Here textual scholarship was as important as the discovery itself. The ability to prove the accuracy of a text was the vehicle through which rights and access to land were secured.

More recent scholarship has focussed on the editorial practices and claims of Hakluyt in *The Principal Navigations*. Anthony Payne in "'Strange, remote, and farre distant Countreys" suggests that Hakluyt scholarship should now focus on Hakluyt's editing practices. While there is now no critical edition of *Navigations*, nor is there one on the horizon, there are a number of excellent studies that have discussed Hakluyt's editorial methods through in-depth studies of individual texts within *Navigations* (Auger, Collinson, and McDermott). Hakluyt's assertion of editorial transparency in the first preface has gathered some attention, but it is clear that Hakluyt is anything but a passive collector of travel texts.

In search of Hakluyt's motivation for *Navigations*, more recent scholarship has looked to the political, focussing on Hakluyt's self proclaimed patriotism and his interest in empire building as foundational motivating forces. Most of these analyses look past *Navigations* to texts like *The Discourse of Western Planting* to uncover Hakluyt's presumed colonial agenda (Morgan and Coote, Collinson, and Neville-Sington). There can be no question that Hakluyt was interested in overseas expansion and development of the new world, and *Navigations* can be seen participating in this work, but the text itself contains many thematic and structural anomalies that often get overlooked in the pursuit of the political. Part of this study will include an examination of the textual structure of *Principal Navigations,* paying specific attention to its formal and editorial engagements, investigating the narrative forms employed. This type of inquiry will attempt to understand how form effects meaning. Rather than looking at formalism as a theory of types, investigating texts for specific literary tropes to define the work as 'epic' or 'lyric,' (Frye, Rasmussen),[2] this study will take as its point of departure an investigation of the 'poetics' of literary form: that is, I will investigate how the epic, lyric, or dialogue represents natural and social realities in different ways.

Because Hakluyt was not working within well-established disciplinary guidelines, his editorial technique and use of literary form differ from those of many of his predecessors and contemporaries. Collections of prose texts were certainly a familiar genre, but because of the diversity Hakluyt made many editorial decisions for himself. There are some historical predecessors whose textual practices loosely conform to Hakluyt's (like Jacob Boemus), and a few who follow the precedent he sets (like Samuel Purchas), but he is in many ways going it alone, constructing a text where disciplinary boundaries are still in flux. The variety of narratives included in *Navigations* demonstrates a particular editorial investment, and suggests an acknowledgement of ontological and rhetorical uncertainty. Hakluyt makes sure to tell the reader that his motivation for collecting the narratives for *The Principal Navigations* was to chronicle English achievements in a single coherent collection, but he also claims to be writing down histories that exist only in an oral form. While there are examples of earlier history writing (the annal and the Tacitean history) Hakluyt's collection implies at least some dissatisfaction with these methods of history. There is evidence that Hakluyt was aware of the history of travel writing. A significant element of this discursive formation was understanding how to produce and reproduce accurate historical narrative. Hakluyt is clearly interested in presenting his book as a collection of truthful accounts, but he has an interesting perspective on how this authenticity is achieved. His claim in the second introduction that he did not change any of the narratives is pushed further when he says that he leaves some in the "homely stile wherein they were first penned" (Hakluyt 1598, *2v). This suggests that different qualities of writing present different access to truth, and acknowledges the significance of stylistic and formal shifts in historical writing. Hakluyt finds historical value in poetry and prose, whether poorly or well written. While it is clear that Hakluyt does not do what he says, there are in fact many moments within *Navigations* where Hakluyt excises, adds, and alters the texts he collects, he is still making a claim to a value-free space in his collection. Inescapable is the question of the impact of the editor on the text. Certainly even if Hakluyt were true to his claim that he changes nothing in the texts he collects, *Navigations* is a product of the subjective knowledge, resources, and aesthetic interests of Hakluyt himself, to say nothing of the many other editorial interests that show up in the book. While this project will in part examine the changes that Hakluyt makes to some of the texts he collects, significant attention will also be paid to the more subtle effects of editorial control.

---

[2] Rasmussen opposes Frye's rigid structural formalism, opposing "modes of analysis that for all their methodological sophistication tend to interpret Renaissance works as bundles of historical or cultural content, without much attention to the ways that their meanings are shaped and enabled by the possibilities of form" (1). Rasmussen not only suggests that form has been overlooked, but that different literary forms participate significantly in the production of meaning.

There certainly are moments where Hakluyt's impact on the text shows itself through his interests and biases. Primarily in new world exploration, there are moments where Hakluyt advises the explorers on how to observe the new world, giving strategies for narrative production. There are narratives that state simply what commodities voyagers should select to bring along, which suggests that the director understands in advance what commodities exist, but there are other instructions, for travel to 'unknown' lands where the instructions highlight narrative concerns (See Chapter I). In these cases, Hakluyt's editorial hand shows itself before the texts are written rather than after, making his claim of editorial transparency moot. The question that these observations leads to is, 'how is it possible to describe *Principal Navigations* as anything other than the subjective representation of physical and social reality?' The answer is simply that it isn't possible. There is no way to read Hakluyt's histories, or any other history for that matter, without acknowledging the subjective element contained within them. Significant in *Navigations* is the way that Hakluyt makes clear the subjective position of his collection, a subjectivity often suppressed in much historical writing. This is in fact the most important intervention of this study, the assertion that Hakluyt had no interest in constructing a stable, objective social or phenomenological reality, and the emphasis that is placed on this subjective position within *Navigations*. I argue that *Navigations* presents history, phenomena, and social interaction as radically unstable, a discourse forever in flux, and one that requires constant adjustment on the part of the historical writer. The presentation of history as bricolage not only demonstrates the interests of the collector, editor, and writer, but also implicates the reader in the construction of historical and social practice. I will argue that Hakluyt's text declares the voyager and collector to be parts of the historical process, and a part of what constitutes objective reality. The point is not that Hakluyt attempts to abolish any trace of subjectivity, to capture some hard kernel of objective reality; rather, he demonstrates how the very hard kernel of objective reality is the subjective position.

The Project

Chapter One of my dissertation investigates the historical position of *Navigations*. Starting from D.M. Woolf's assessment that early modern historiography was in a state of flux, I demonstrate how *Navigations* interpolates and responds to the changing methodology of historical knowledge. A formal and rhetorical double agent, *Navigations* at once participates in the chronicle tradition out of which it grows, and exceeds its boundaries in form and structure. Departing from Giovanni Batista Ramusio, Johannes Boemus, and Richard Eden, Hakluyt develops historical writing by destabilizing the two opposing poles of textual authority: experience and theory. Including contradictory first person accounts along with suspicious and at times blatantly erroneous theoretical extrapolation, Hakluyt undermines the essentialist demand for stable textual representation of external reality, a position he underscores in his introduction where he suggests that "there is not any history in the world (the most Holy writ excepted) whereof we are precisely bound to beleeue ech word and syllable" (Hakluyt 1598, **1r).

Chapter Two further problematizes written authority through an investigation into the diverse media within *Navigations*. Examining how Hakluyt juxtaposes standard travel narratives with poems, ships' charts, and fictional dialogue, I argue that *Navigations* reshapes textual authority, asking history to be poetical and poetry to be historical; multiple media diversify while destabilizing historical narrative. The rejection of an absolute or total narrative history arises from the assertion that heterogenous textual representation is required to capture an inherently heterogenous historical reality. Charting the critical reception of *Navigations,* I show how the critic's resistance to the formal diversity within *Navigations* often leads them to efface essential elements of the text in their analyses. Rejection of the formal diversity of *Navigations* is a rejection of historical multiplicity and betrays a critical desire for an internally consistent means of communication and a consistent, objective reality.

The initial two chapters serve as an introduction to the case studies in Chapter Three. Here I examine the multiple voyages in search of a northeast and northwest passages respectively. The four narratives of Anthony Jenkinson's voyages to Russia negotiate the oral and textual difficulties of political and social discourse, while Martin Frobisher's three voyages in search of a northwest passage exhibit fundamental interests in geographical exploration and the excavation of commodities. I argue that Jenkinson's troubles with the Tsar Ivan underscore the communicative disparities that arise from disparate social, mercantile, and economic systems, and emphasize how communication is mediated through social constructs other than language. The trajectory of the three narratives of Martin Frobisher creates what I describe as hermeneutic circles, allowing me to dramatize the inconsistencies of first person accounts and problematize the stylistic, experiential, and linguistic play in narrative proper. In each of these case studies, but more significantly with Frobisher's texts, I examine what Hakluyt includes and excludes, suggesting that Hakluyt's omissions, even if unintentional, create a reflexive loop that destabilizes textual authority and subjectively inserts the reader as the boundary of the text.

In Chapter Four I investigate the ways in which the text reflexively speaks to itself. Enlisting the critical rigor of twentieth-century textual criticism and the theories that underlie textual preparation and production, I argue that Hakluyt gives us a text in step with the more progressive contemporary textual scholarship. I then move to an investigation of the printed marginalia within *Navigations,* arguing that they indicate multiple moments of editorial intervention, which in turn facilitate multiple reading practices. As codex technology works as a random access memory, the marginal notes not only add thematic commentary, but aid in what Peter Stallybrass calls discontinuous reading (Stallybrass 44). The marginal notes act as signs, pointing the reader to specific moments within the text, and facilitate discontinuous leaps within the text itself. The notes also participate in an intertextual dialogue, one that refers to texts within *Navigations* and without. The breadth of cross-references in *Navigations* through textual and marginal note references indicate a complex dialogue underway within early modern travel literature, and simultaneously reveals the multiple participants in each single perspective and text. Each text within *Navigations* has several compilers, sometimes more than one writer, and multiple editors and a wealth of interior and exterior commentary.

From this position I argue that the various formal and material elements of the text as a whole position the reader as the final boundary of the text. Fundamental to an ethics of reading is the recognition that it is not corrupt methods of representation that hold back some objectively knowable reality – that behind each formal and subjective text there is some authentic 'true' reality – but rather that it is the absence of any objectively fixed reality that gives fuel to the multiplicity of subjective positions and discursive forms. This, I argue, is the beginning of ethics, where the subject recognizes the self in participation with textual and ontological production.

Chapter I

What God Hath Wrot: Historicity in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*

When I was completing graduate course work, a professor suggested in class that each of us, as we worked to complete an English dissertation, would have at some point to make a distinction between history and fiction. Although none of us were able to articulate a clear distinction at the time, he used Frederic Jameson who, when discussing history and fiction, suggests that

> The form giving power of historiography would appear to be enhanced, rather than diminished, by the "factuality" of its content: that is, it is the independent existence of something like raw material, something like the historical "facts" (*histoire*), that underscores the shaping power of historical discourse as it imposes on the content what must in the nature of things be only one possible version of those facts. (155)

My professor pointed to the absence of any desire for resolution in the historical text, that historical texts, because of the raw material, demand a specific formal structure outside of the interests of the author. He suggested that Jameson's assertion that history presents events as objective facts undermines any interest in closure or resolution. At the time I was convinced by this explanation, having yet to think of a distinction between history and fiction for myself, but as I progressed through early modern historical tracts, Jameson's answer has become less satisfying to me. I think I understand the spirit of Jameson's distinction, that most fiction is capable of creating artificial closure, and that history does not have some grand figure, i.e., the author, orchestrating and conducting the narrative. But this historical theory, if it can indeed be attributed to Jameson, appears to overlook the resistance to resolution found in much of what is called post-modern literature. It's hard to think of resolution in the novels of Samuel Beckett, where the protagonist paradoxically suggests "you don't know, you must go on, I can't go on, I'll go on" (Beckett 1955, 476) or "Try again, fail again, fail better" (Beckett 1996, 89). Conversely, after reading hundreds of early modern travel texts, it is clear that often there is a very specific desire for closure in historical narrative, one that often precedes the writing of the text itself. It seems unlikely that any reader of historical narrative would suggest that historical narratives present an objective, value-free picture of the world. Certainly historical narratives will in some way reflect the agenda of the writer, presenting the specific discoveries and accomplishments of the historian. These texts have often been categorized as propaganda (coincidentally, Hakluyt has often been accused of writing propaganda: Williamson 1941, 56-85, and Wright 33-56). The subjective nature of exploration and discovery that I see in early modern travel writing often depicts a vested interest in specific types of closure. Rarely was there a romantic figure off in search of adventure, letting the seas take him where they would. Most travel was inspired by very specific institutional, economic, or social goals, and writers sometimes fabricated discoveries when attaining these specific goals proved excessively difficult. I would argue that the concept of historical objectivity depends on a repressed desire, a desire for an objective and clearly knowable history. Part of the overall trajectory of this dissertation is to highlight the ways in which Hakluyt's *Navigations* repeatedly exposes the subjective and conflicted nature of historical narrative, and how this desire for an objective reality in fact achieves its opposite. More specifically, this chapter will set Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* within the context of early modern history writing to examine points of contention and convergence in Hakluyt's historical method with previous historical writers and compilers.

The Writing of history

The question of authority and what made a text authoritative was a hot button issue in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The distinction between early modern and medieval history is often located in the question of authority. In *The Autonomy of History,* Joseph Levine suggests that, "Throughout the Middle Ages authors had invented fictions and passed them off as histories, or written histories into which they intruded fictions, almost without criticism" (16). Levine suggests that growing technological advances fuelled a change in perception. With the increased capacity to travel and explore unknown areas of the planet, for instance, objections to this fictional sort of history writing grow with experiential discoveries. This in turn leads to different, specifically scientific and empirical methods of analysing the world. Levine suggests further that

> What was missing [from medieval history], apparently, was the early modern idea of history, in which it is thought that something like a true and literal description of the past could be winnowed out and distinguished from fiction. Medieval historiography worked largely by accretion, rarely ever by subtraction; a story once told gained authority by mere reiteration and the passage of time. (17)

The early modern period is not the seminal moment of the distinction between history and fiction, but it is clear that questions regarding historical form and content obtained an added significance in the period. This distinction between early modern and medieval history has become something of a critical shorthand, but the transition was neither smooth nor seamless. There are several so-called historical writers for whom Levine's historical trajectory hits a temporal bump, not the least of whom is Richard Hakluyt.

Hakluyt – along with some of his contemporaries like André Thevet– does not recognize clear distinction between history, fiction, and myth that Levine suggests was current. As I shall show a little further on, Hakluyt collects narratives that cover a broad spectrum of genre and form; there are many classical references in *Navigations* and occasionally overtly fictional moves as well.

A significant problem for early modern historians was the relatively unclear picture of the new world. In *New Worlds, Ancient Texts*, Anthony Grafton assesses the development of historical method in a similar way to Levine. Grafton suggests that before the discovery of the new world, ontological truth, the assertion of what made up physical reality, was as much the domain of the classroom as anything else (3). What he calls "Chronicle historical authority" was a textual one; scholars would use texts to theorize and extrapolate the makeup of exterior reality. Histories often drew upon one another, which created a process of history that amounted to something like extrapolating from extrapolation. Eventually there was a shift away from what Grafton calls a systematic, or mainly textual, transmission of history in the medieval period to an empirical and experiential one, but one with significant roadblocks. In his analysis of Jacob Boemus and Sebastian Munster, Grafton illustrates their mutual difficulty of accurately assessing new world realities:

> Boemus, though clearly inspired by the discoveries [of new world explorers], had largely stuck to the areas covered by ancient writers; Munster tried to cover the New World too. But where the data squirmed and writhed, Munster proved no better than Boemus at making them behave. He not only inherited contradictions from his source, but added to them. His survey, at once shapeless and vivid, reproduces not the orderly cosmos of the *Chronicle* but a kaleidoscopic variety of facts and images that danced tauntingly around the learned European, like succubi around

> Faust, when he tried to survey the world in 1550. (100)

Grafton suggests that Munster and Boemus were working in a typically "classical mode" (106), and that the new empirical data presented to them fit uncomfortably into their structured systems. Where the system of collation let historians present theoretical knowledge as seamless internally consistent histories, the new experiential data was full of contradiction. In the absence of a way of collating the new data, of excluding or adjusting it to fit the new system, Munster includes it all, creating a chaotic kaleidoscope of history rather than a rational, ordered world.

Certainly the discovery of the new world and the new types of data exposed the cracks in classical systems of representation, but there is a reciprocal effect here as well. Often empirical data gets shoehorned into classical systems of representation. Sebastian Munster and Jacob Boemus were working within a classical mode of representation, but their work produces an added effect as well. Many early modern travellers would return from the new world with depictions of indigenous people that surprisingly and strangely resembled Europeans. Theodore de Bry's famous copper engravings have gathered much critical attention for precisely this reason. Both Mary Baine Campbell and O. R. Dathorn have commented on the way a European notion of body image is effected through contact with the new world (see below). This superimposition of European reality on the new world allowed Munster and others to present, if not a coherent and ordered picture of the world, one that was "surprisingly objective" (Grafton, 1992 107). The old-world scholar's experience of the new world resulted in a wealth of information that either disrupted the systems of phenomenological understanding or misrepresented the new world experience. Within the limitation of the classical form, Munster could neither "create a sound new vessel nor dam the stream of information that threatened to overwhelm him. Instead he varnished the surface of the old one, energetically plugged its leaks, and ignored the water that still poured in" (Grafton, 1992 111). As a result, many early modern historiographers that followed were left with the dilemma Grafton points to: unruly data that disrupted the formal structure of history and historical orthodoxy that assumed history – both natural and social – to progress in an orderly fashion.

The twofold nature of this problem stems from a scholarly choice of either a fidelity to classical forms or a maverick interest in scholarly innovation. The split between medieval systematic history and innovative and empirical experiential history is the split that distinguishes medieval from early modern for Grafton. Grafton sees a shift happening gradually over the early modern period, where systematic history is replaced by more innovative and empirical methods of history and phenomenology. Grafton suggests that eventually,

> The age of a system of thought became a sign not of authority but of obsolescence, and many of those who insisted on the aesthetic superiority of classical literature admitted the substantive supremacy of modern science. Novelty became the sign not of an idea's radicalism but of its validity. (1992, 5)

According to Grafton, through the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the academic system of constructing history and phenomena increasingly lost its validity. The reasons for clinging to classical methods of history were grounded in the aesthetic power of classical writers. What follows from the displacement of classical history is the simultaneous displacement of aesthetic value in history writing. Grafton's distinction does not happen at the flip of a switch, and throughout much of the early modern period these two schools of thought are at war with each other. Hakluyt's contribution to historical writing shows he is working within both schools of thought, contributing texts of significant aesthetic achievement as well as exceedingly dull but factual texts.

The move to empirical observation and experimentation, though novel, was also often seen as innovative and anti-systematic, even though it was nothing of the sort.

Francis Bacon was caught in this paradox, attempting to remove what he called the idols from the mind to clear a path for the intuitive reception of the world (Bacon, *Organon* 18-46). Michael McCanles has pointed out that

> Intuition was for Bacon unmediated contact with objects that are present … and for him, as for the nominalists who precede him, was the only ground of objective knowledge. On the other hand, the objective knowledge of nature which constitutes a science is in turn necessarily conceptual and structured as a system of interlocked propositions, and the price such knowledge pays for its structure is its removal from intuition. (25)

The result for much of early modern historiography is a combination of the two, where new information alters a system of understanding and is at the same time affected by its systematicity.

Hakluyt is certainly one of the people who inherits this unruly tradition, with a few slight changes. Unlike many other historians in the period like Sebastian Munster, André Thevet, and Theodore de Bry, Hakluyt does not write himself into the narratives he collects, and while he does change some of the texts – in spite of the fact that he claims not to – it is hard to conclude that his excisions and other changes are designed to create a uniform, internally consistent historical narrative. Quite the contrary, Hakluyt repeatedly draws attention to the instability of his or any other historical text, suggesting that there is much in most historical texts that is inaccurate or incorrect. There are more subtle contradictions, where two sources present slightly different accounts of the same event (see chapter three). Hakluyt is not distancing himself from medieval or classical historians who believed Atlantis, Prester John, and Sciopods existed. He is rather suggesting that all written texts, save the Bible, are open to error. Whether one takes this claim at face value or not is a separate story. It is possible that Hakluyt, in an effort to distance himself from possible political implications of the book, foregrounds the contingency of his text. This state of exception, however, seems already to lie at least in part in the fact that he collects, rather than writes the narratives in *Navigations*. Hakluyt makes clear that the voice of history, wherever and whoever it comes from, has a measure of inaccuracy always already there.

Stephen Greenblatt and the school of New Historicism have tackled the social positioning and voice of historical narrative. In *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*, Greenblatt reads Montaigne's "Of Cannibals" and suggests that "Discursive authority in the early literature of travel . . . derives from a different source than it would in other forms of poesis – not from an appeal to higher wisdom or social superiority but from a miming, by the elite, of the simple, direct, unfigured language of perception Montaigne and others attribute to servants" (147). Both Grafton and Greenblatt point out a change in the place and practice of different types of ontological work. Where Grafton focuses on the formal and structural problems empirical evidence present in classical modes of historical work, Greenblatt is interested in discursive voice, pointing out that the information discovered in the field could be advantageously written in a simple language that everyone could understand. Greenblatt's analysis follows Grafton in the removal of aesthetic principles. Greenblatt's suggestion is as much about the capacity of language as it is about the interest in audience. The authentic voice of the lower classes suggests a proximity to a specific experience, which in turn indicates a specific sort of authenticity.

The miming that Greenblatt sees happening in early modern history writing retains some of the tenor of the fictional histories Levine suggests were on the decline. Apparently stylistic channelling is acceptable where experiential channeling is not. Both Grafton and Greenblatt suggest that early modern explorers were interested in discovering an authentic reality, interested in finding and representing the phenomenological truth of the world. Indeed, the number of travel narratives that claim to present a clear and true account of any specific event attests to the value early modern historians placed on truth in early modern travel writing. Paradoxically, these repeated claims to truth also register a certain anxiety about the stability of the text. Who would write a 'vague and false account' of a voyage? The suggestion of truth in the title is on some level a reaction to the fiction-like narratives of the medieval period; but this claim is not universally observed. There certainly are narratives in *Navigations* that make just this sort of claim to truth, but there are also many narratives that do not. The inclusion of both in *Navigations* suggests an equivalent, but different, valuation of both types of evidence.

By citing an example from Montaigne, Greenblatt shows a shift in perspective from above. His observation notes less a change in the message than a change in its form. *Navigations* presents many examples where the location of the voice itself has moved, or where multiple voices are present. There narratives that show a difference in writerly expertise or the source comes from some an oral report. But it is not a simple shift in perspective that makes *Navigations* interesting; it is the plurivocal presentation of historical narrative, to borrow a Bakhtinian term, its acknowledged diversity, that adds a distinctive nuance. The story that emerges from *Navigations* is much too diverse to be traced back to a single class source or genre.

A provocative assessment of historical change in the early modern period comes from D.R. Woolf. In "Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England," Woolf suggests that, "the *idea* of history, as much as its practice, was in a state of ferment in Renaissance England" (47, emphasis in original). Not only was historical writing and practice in a state of flux, but so too was the way individuals understood their place in history. Woolf suggests further that a narrative shift in what constituted authoritative history was underway in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:

> In early modern England, as elsewhere in Europe, narrative history commonly took two forms. A moribund chronicle tradition lingered through the sixteenth century to breathe its last in the seventeenth. Meanwhile, the influence of humanist rhetoric triggered the development in the Elizabethan era of a more sophisticated and elegant political narrative, the authors of which confined their gaze principally to medieval and modern times; they emulated the practice of the ancients without stealing their material. (13 – 14)

There is a bit of both Greenblatt and Grafton in this statement. According to Woolf, emulation of the historical practice of the ancients demonstrated a concern with historical events closer in time and place to the present. This new method of history writing allowed historians to sidestep the problems of tradition that gave earlier writers like Sebastian Munster so much trouble. Without the troubling texts from older authorities there was no need to square new data against old. Writers of history were careful to create new narratives rather than repeat old ones. From this the concept of history evolves through theorists like Thomas Hobbes, who as D.R. Woolf suggests "considered history as the register of all factual knowledge" (Woolf, "Erudition" 18). This distinction eventually leads to a harder distinction between "history proper, a truthful account of real events, and poetry or fable, the account of the verisimilar or fabulous" (Woolf, "Erudition" 19), something more in league with the historical structure that Levine envisions.

Hakluyt's historical contribution shows he is not yet ready to completely embrace so-called real events exclusively. A cursory look at *Navigations* shows that Hakluyt is astride each of these historical distinctions. *Navigations* exhibits the influence of medieval chronicle, an affect that has on occasion led to negative aesthetic judgements, but also demonstrates the influence of humanist editing and rhetorical strategies. It is also often concerned with first hand experiential knowledge, something Woolf suggests was important to some historians, but not to all. There were those in the early modern period who questioned the reliability of first hand accounts. In "Theatrum Libri: Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy and the Failure of the Encyclopaedic Form" Christopher Gross suggests that Burton was scornful of eyewitness accounts. When writing about religious melancholy, Gross suggests that the absence of reliable authorities, Burton must "Abandon his usual reliance on scholarly consensus . . . and rely instead on dubious authority of the eyewitness – a necessity unaltered by his low opinion of such testimony " (Gross 85). According to Gross, people like Burton desired a specific sort of consensus, and a specific sort of proximity or knowledge of an event on which to base textual authority. Burton's interest in historical narrative would fall with people like Thomas More or Francis Bacon, both of whom wrote histories of monarchs based in part on their own court experience. Although neither was a part of the household of the respective monarchs they write about, they were intimately aware of courtly protocol. *Navigations* similarly asks for first hand expertise, but often in places where those in the position of experience are not equipped with the same scholarly tools as those with access to a monarch's inner circle. Each practice registers a specific type of consistency: with More and Bacon, proximity to royalty allows for speculative history writing, since both More and Bacon were involved with courtly proceedings but not with the monarchs they write histories of. In *Navigations* this transferable writerly expertise loses some of its significance: Hakluyt includes narratives of direct experience, or as close as he can find, and more creatively constructed historical accounts like those of Francis Bacon and Thomas More.

Perhaps not so surprisingly, it is not simply the discovery of the new world that shook the foundations of ontological truth. Problems of representation abound in narratives of travel to Eastern Europe and Asia. As I will argue in chapter three, *Navigations* shows that Anthony Jenkinson and his retinue had as much trouble accurately describing Russia as Columbus or Munster had describing the new world. The problem was not simply an absence of an appropriate taxonomy or system, nor a question of historical or physical proximity, but something bound up in the fundamentals of representation itself. *Navigations* demonstrates the complexity of not only finding the truth, but representing the truth.

There are examples of Greenblattian miming, where prominent figures write in an 'unadorned' style, but there are also examples where *Navigations* goes much further than mime (see the discussion of *Libell of English Policie* below 53). Theories of language current in Hakluyt's historical period often suggested that certain writing styles were appropriate for discussing certain topics. Upset with what he saw as the excessive ornamentation of scholarly language, Francis Bacon, in *The Advancement of Learning*, sought to restore language to a kind of pre-lapsarian state, which meant simplifying rather than complicating language (Bacon, *Works* 210-250). While attention to language is important to Hakluyt there are also moments where added historical context is included to help the reader. Hakluyt includes several narratives from Richard Eden. Eden writes the history of "A voiage made out of *England* vnto *Guinea* and *Benin* in *Affrike,* at the charges of certaine marchants Aduenturers of of the Citie of *London,* in the yeere of our Lord 1553" (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 9). The voyage is made by Thomas Windam, and Eden suggests that he

> was desired by certaine of [his] friends to make some mention of this Uoiage, that some memorie thereof might remaine to our posteritie, if either iniquitie of time consuming all things or ignorance creeping in by barbarousnesse and contempt of knowledge should hereafter bury in obliuion so woorthie attempts. (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 9)[3]

---

[3] This narrative is followed by a longer narrative of a voyage to Guinea by Michael Lok

Eden is interested in preserving what he sees as worthy accounts of English merchants, but he recognizes that narratives of voyages to foreign places could be offputting and difficult to read. Therefore, he prefaces this narrative with a commentary on Africa to help contextualize the travel narrative so "that these voyages may be more plainly vnderstood of all men" (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 9).

In the pursuit of the true and real, direct experience does become an important tool in historical and phenomenological writing. T. J. Cribb suggests that personal experience was necessary for the production of history. In "Writing up the Log: The Legacy of Hakluyt," he argues eloquently that textual authority is eventually validated by individual experience rather than scholarly authority. He concludes that the 'new' definition of history is not objective but subjective because of first-hand accounts, and is necessarily articulated to political or social concerns. Hakluyt's road to this personal sort of authority is often not direct. Many travel texts are written by people who were not along on the voyages, the narrative cobbled together from multiple sources. Many early modern texts also show a clear ideological bias. George Peckham, who writes about the voyages and discoveries of Humphrey's voyages to the new world, lays out a long discourse on the preferable modes of interaction between the English and the indigenous people of the new world. Arguing from the outset that the English should at all times act honourably and deal equitably with the "savages," he muddies the waters by suggesting that they can gain native favour by assisting the savages in defending themselves against their adversaries. Peckham writes of David Ingram's experiences with both savages and cannibals, noting Ingram's distinction between the two and suggests that the savages are in need of English help:

---

in 1554 (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 14-23).

> For it appeareth by the relation of a Countryman of ours, namely *Dauid Ingram*, (who trauelled in those countries i. Moneths and more) That the Sauages generally for the most part, are at continuall warres with their next adioyning neighbours, and especially the Cannibals, being a cruell kinde of people, whose foode is man's flesh, and hue teeth lke dogges, and doe pursue them with rauenous mindes to eate their flesh, and deuoure them. (Hakluyt 1600, 169)

Peckham's information is rather convoluted; the savage cannibals are described by less savage savages to Ingram who gives this information to Peckham. At best Peckham and Ingram fail to take into account the potential political implications of one race describing an enemy. At its worst, this sort of speculation validates a host of harmful interventions. Approval for violence against dangerous cannibals is much more reasonable than attacking noble savages. From a narrative perspective, references to dangerous others makes good copy, and the rhetorical structure is a persuasive tool to encourage overseas expansion and exploration. Ingram's account of his voyage with John Hawkins is included in the 1589 edition of *Navigations*, it is an oral source, but is only obliquely referred to in the later edition. Ingram is still an authority, and his expertise is put to a suspicious use, but the absence of his narrative in the second edition of *Navigations* points to his diminished value.

As his argument proceeds, Peckham invokes an insidious slippage with the above terms. Drawing from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, Peckham describes how Constantine the Great enlarged his "Empire by the subduing of his next neighbours, but also endeuoured by all meanes to subiect all such remote Barbarous and Heathen nations, as then inhabited the foure quaters of the worlde" (Hakluyt 1600, 172). Constantine subdues the heathens with a combination of conversion and force; the converted become a part of his colonial force, and those not interested or capable of converting to

Christianity are destroyed. These noble battles with monsters and the equally noble search for Prester John become the justification for new battles against North American peoples. The rhetorical move here is to cast the act of trade and development as a front for conversion and war. The distinction between savage and cannibal, between the body open to violence and the one open to communication and trade, becomes less clear with the invocation of barbarity and heathenism. There is no clear distinction between heathen or barbarian and savage or cannibal. The intervention is coercive or violent, and at times both.

Peckham's argument reaches its apogee by cleverly implicating his own nation in the history of colonialism. Peckham recognizes his nation as a colonial force – and he is very much in support of England's colonial exploits – but he also gestures towards England's pre-colonial history. Peckham suggests that there are few areas of the globe that have not felt the sanitizing touch of Christianity, and that most of these nations were introduced to it by some imperial force. He suggests that Constantine,

> with great hazard and labour, making his iourney thither [to Africa], at last became victour ouer them all, euen to the countrey of the *Blemmyans,* and the remote *AEthiopians,* that now are the people of *Presbyter Iohn,* who yet till this day continue and beare the name of Christians. (Hakluyt 1600, 172)

Constantine is able to convert even the most savage of savages, the Blemmyae and Ethiopians – and his plantation of Christian belief has taken hold and persists. From here, Peckham asserts his own nation's former barbarity, and how Constantine is in fact the father of English Christianity and thus the father of English colonialism:

> For (as it is written) the Emperour [Constantine] thoroughly ayded with a puissant armie of valient souldiers whom he had before perswaded to Christian religion, in

> proper person himselfe came even unto this our country of England, then called the Island of the Britaines, bending from him full West, which he wholy conquered, made tributarie, and setled therein Christian faith, and left behind him such Rulers thereof, as to his wisedome seemed best. (Hakluyt 1600, 172)

Peckham's invocation of his own nation's past barbarity is a sharp rhetorical move, casting the English as redeemed proselytisers and civilizers of the indigenous people they encounter. The English and the natives of the new world are cast as equivalents of sorts: each at some point were barbarous until exposed to the truth of Christianity. Within this rhetoric, the English are different allochronically only, existing in a different space of the same socio-cultural evolutionary scale.[4]

Hakluyt's inclusion of these texts by Eden and Peckham shows at least an interest in forgrounding experiential evidence over the theoretical, but information still passes through more than one figure. Eden and Peckham rely primarily on documentary evidence, and while each suggests that they gather first hand material there are cases where the source text is unavailable, as with Ingram, or lost, in the case of Eden's reconstructions of Lok and Windam. In Peckham's case the text shows an ideological bias that at least encourages overseas expansion, and at worst allows or endorses violence. But not all early modern readers were oblivious to the ideological ends of classical authority. One of the more provocative moments of writing back against textual authority is a narrative by Arngrimus Jonas, who writes a two-part history of Iceland for King Christian III of Denmark. The text is split into two sections. The first section deals with geography and the second with the inhabitants and culture. A self-proclaimed Icelander, Jonas plays the local authority, correcting problematic foreign writings about his country. Jonas begins each chapter with an exposition of historical claims about Iceland from a wide cross-section of early modern historians and cosmographers that includes Sebastian Munster, Gerard Mercator, and Gemma Frisius. Jonas plays the careful scholar, carefully presenting and debunking the classical accounts of his island. He is clearly familiar with the writings he takes up, and, at least initially, resists harsh criticism, evaluating each text on its merits and faults. At times pedantic – he rails against Munster's inaccurate assessment of the length of the island when he is a mere seven miles off – he does give each writer some credit, suggesting that they do get some elements of Iceland right. With Munster's and Frisius' description of the mountain ranges of Iceland, Jonas quotes Munster's claim that,

---

[4] The term allochronism was developed by Johannes Fabian in his study on anthropological practice *Time and the Other*. Fabian defines allochronism as the practice of locating a native or foreign culture in relation to its own, for example, describing the Pocomchi people in Guatamala as existing in a stone-age culture. Fabian not surprisingly suggests that this reduction of the other to the same is a fundamental flaw in anthropological practice (32).

> There be in this Iland mountaines lift vp to the skies, whose tops being white with perpetuall snowe, their roots boile with euerlasting fire. The first is towards the West, called *Hecla:* the other the mountaine of the crosse: and the third *Helga.* Item: *Zieglerus.* The rocke or promontorie of *Hecla* boileth with continuall fire. Item: *Saxo.* There is in this Iland also a mountaine, which resembling the starrie firmament, with perpetuall flashings of fire, continueth alwayes burning, by vncessant belching out of flames. (Hakluyt 1598, 556)

Jonas qualifies this information, gently correcting Munster, suggesting that written authority doesn't necessarily get it right all the time: "For that which they heere affirme of mount Hecla, although it hath some shew of trueth: notwithstanding concerning the other two mountains, that they should burne with perpetual fire, it is a manifest errour" (Hakluyt 1598, 556). He quickly admits that Munster and Frisus could simply be making a mistake of reference, since there was another mountain that had erupted, "casting up [an] abundance of stones and ashes" (Hakluyt 1598, 556), but then quickly removes this provision, suggesting this mountain is rather far away from Hecla.

In taking issue with Munster and the others, Jonas aims to demystify both the geographical and social depiction of Iceland. He is concerned with factual accuracy, but clearly there is an understanding of the consequences of having Iceland misrepresented in this way. Jonas saves his most venomous attack for historical writings and writers that mystify Iceland and its people. Joachimus Leo, who according to Jonas often erroneously proclaims the marvels of Iceland, is "a man worthy to become Lion Foode" (Hakluyt 1598, 552). Jonas initially uses common sense to show how the geography of Iceland is quite normal. When discussing the earthquakes that often occur he asks, "is it possible therefore that they should seeme strange, or monstrous, whenas they proceed from natural causes?" (Hakluyt 1598, 556). Jonas is certainly put out by the exaggerations of foreigners, and while he is using his position as an Icelander as the bedrock of his authority, he does not exclude classical authorities. Instead of displacing the significance of classical authority, Jonas enlists it to defend the normalcy of Iceland. Citing Pliny and several others, Jonas shows how the geography and society of Iceland are actually rather normal, and asks how it is possible for so called historical authorities to be so shocked by something they should have experienced in print:

> Howbeit, it be seemeth not the authority and learning of such great clearks to marueile at this, who can not but well know the flames of mount *Aetna,* which (according to *Plinie*) bing full of snowe all Winter, notwithstanding (as the same man witnesseth) it doth alwayes burne. (Hakluyt 1598, 557)

Here Jonas is opposing Munster's and Frisius' description of the mountains of Iceland as the "woonders of Island" (Hakluyt 1598, 556). He is clearly worried about the ways in which Frisius and Munster describe Iceland, aware of the potential dangers of the terms "wonder" and "marvel". As with the invocation of mysterious Blemmyae, Sciopods, and cannibals, this sort of magical attribution potentially opens up the country and its people to dangerous foreign intervention, and Jonas shrewdly aims at normalizing the descriptions of his nation to avoid any potential foreign influence.

Jonas' clever insult here accuses the learned authority not only of misconstruing geographical elements of Iceland, but also of not reading the classical authorities thoroughly enough either. As Jonas delves further into the more fantastic elements of Munster's and Frisius' accounts, his critique becomes increasingly more strident. When discussing Munster's story of a group of men nearly escaping drowning when the whale they thought was an island submerged, he can barely contain his contempt:

> But in what ground should the anker be fastened? for Mariners for the most part are destitute of such long cables, whereby they may let downe an anker to the bottom of the maine sea, therefore vpon the backs of Whales, saith *Munster*. But then they had need first to bore a hole for the flouke to take hold in. O silly Mariners, that in digging cannot discerne Whales flesh from lumps of earth, nor know the slippery skin of a Whale from the vpper part of the ground: without doubt they are woorthy to haue *Munster* for a Pilot. (Hakluyt 1598, 568)

Jonas dismisses Munster through simple logic; indeed, who could mistake whale flesh for solid earth? Along with these logical objections, Jonas is keen to show how the narratives that come from the many different visitors who have written about Iceland are by no means consistent. In his discussion of the longitude and latitude of Iceland, Jonas includes a chart that shows the discrepancies varying from 20 degrees in Munster to 325 in Mercator (Hakluyt 1598, 554). Playing one authority off against another, Jonas shows how the group of so-called experts can't establish something as concrete as the longitude of a particular place, something that is ostensibly hard science. Aside from collective inconsistency, Jonas uncovers internal inconsistencies within many of the individual historians, suggesting that at one point Munster says that "Island conteineth many people living onely with the food of cattel," only to contradict himself later saying that Icelanders "live there for the most part upon fishes" (Hakluyt 1598, 584).

Jonas' suggestion regarding Munster's piloting skills has an added metaphorical dimension. Through an anecdote of the Roman leader Pompey the Great charged with bringing back foodstuffs to a destitute Rome, Jonas, like Hakluyt, metaphorically describes the value of his work and the dangers of the job:

> For when he [Pompey] made haste towards *Rome,* and a mighty and dangerous tempest arising, he perceiued the Pilots to tremble, and to be vnwilling to commit themselues to the rigor of the stormie sea, himselfe first going on boord, and commanding the anchors to be weighed, brake foorth into these words: *That we should sayle necessitie vrgeth: but that we should liue, it vrgeth not.* In which words he seemeth wisely to inferre, that greater care is to be had of our countrey lying in danger, then of our owne priuate safetie. (Hakluyt 1598, 550)

Jonas compares his situation to Pompey's, suggesting he harbours a similar nationalism and devotion to his cause. Where Pompey feeds the bodies of his people, Jonas' labour feeds the minds of Icelanders and foreigners alike. He also claims his work to be no less dangerous than sailing a stormy sea, metaphorically referring to writing as a voyage:

> I boldly aduenture to present these fewe meditations of mine vnto the viewe of the world, and so boysing vp sailes to commit my selfe vnto a troublesome sea, and to breake foorth into the like speeches with him. (Hakluyt 1598, 551)

The added metaphorical dimension of this comment, however, points not only to Jonas' daring scholarship, but also to Munster's inept scholarship. The pilot is both a figure asked to steer ships through dangerous seas and a textual and scholarly guide, navigating the seas of historical knowledge. Where Pompey is bringing respite to one nation only, textual steps, and occasionally missteps, reach the entire world.

While Jonas and Peckham have specific ideological goals for their writing, there are other arguments within *Navigations* that ask for a more fundamental phenomenological truth in representation. Jonas and Peckham each have a foothold in previous textual authority, but with the case of André Thevet and Thomas Nicols, the dispute is much more antagonistic. Nicols publishes a text of his voyage to the Canary Islands to correct what he sees as previous misrepresentations:

> MIne intent is particularly to speake of the *Canaria* Ilands, which are seuen in number, wherein I dwelt the space of seuen yeres and more, because I finde such variety in sundry writers, and especially great vntruths, in a booke called The New found world Antarctike, set out by a French man called *Andrew Theuet,* the which his booke he dedicated to the Cardinall of *Sens,* keeper of the great seale of *France.*
>
> It appeareth by the sayd booke that he had read the works of sundry Phylosophers, Astronomers, and Cosmographers, whose opinions he gathered together. But touching his owne trauell, which he affirmeth, I

> refer to the iudgement of the expert in our dayes, and therefore for mine owne part I write of these *Canaria* Ilands, as time hath taught me in many yeres. (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 3)

Nicols' response is very similar to Jonas'. Each feels that previous authority is misrepresenting certain phenomenological realities. Nicols' response also looks a lot like a fundamental shift from classical to experiential methods of historiography. The most important element of phenomenological truth for Nicols is experience. At issue is Thevet's classical approach of mastering textual authority to produce a new authoritative narrative. Thevet supplements his brief one- or two-week visit to the Canary Islands through textual collation in a library, writing himself into a narrative of events he only partly experiences.

This is not the first time that Thevet is singled out for attack. Nicols here repeats a common early modern demand in his call for empirical evidence. The problem with much of ancient historical narrative, according to Nicols, is the reliance on textual evidence rather than empirical or experiential evidence. For Nicols, first-hand experience is not only primary to theoretical extrapolation but is also considered to be transparent. Nicols points to the problems of collating narrative in the production of phenomena by going to the Canary Islands and stating that his experience was contrary to the sundry philosophers, astronomers, and cosmographers collated by Thevet. Similarly, Jean de Léry responds to Thevet's descriptions of Brazil in his own *Histoire d'un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil*. The circumstances are quite similar: Léry spends several years in Brazil and Thevet mere weeks. The point is that experiential evidence is the corrective to a textually produced reality. The interesting element here is that previous textual authority has no place in Nicols' writing. Phenomena are misrepresented precisely because of the reliance on texts rather than experience. Nicols asserts the primacy of experiential knowledge as objective knowledge. He believes that he is presenting the authoritative description of the islands, free from personal bias and distracting theory.

The image of writing or editing as travel is a metaphor deployed in several different places in *Navigations*. In the dedicatory epistle to each of the three volumes of *Navigations*, Hakluyt makes some sort of reference to his work as travel. He never presents it in the stark terms that Jonas does, but the language of travel often drifts into his rhetoric. Mary Fuller suggests in *Voyages in Print* that "Hakluyt describes his editorial work in terms of extreme and heroic effort and, indeed suffering" (153), and he indeed compares his labour to the labours of the voyagers he collects (Hakluyt 1589, *4r). Fuller challenges Hakluyt's claim, suggesting that his work relies on textual rather than empirical efficacy (153-168), but suggests it was a claim accepted by the English public. Hakluyt, like Jonas, is in part dramatizing the dangers of the work in hopes of securing some sort of patronage. Jonas argues that by writing he necessarily opens himself up to attack both physically and in print, a hazard "which [he] see[s] is commonly incident to all men, that publish any writings" (Hakluyt 1589, 551). Dramatizing the dangers, then, can only make the position of the patron all the more magnanimously regal in his support.

Fuller's dismissal of Hakluyt's claim seems reasonable. It is true that Hakluyt does not himself empirically validate any of the narratives he collects.[5] He is in part at the mercy of the truth claims of the writers. Here Hakluyt is more closely aligned with the textual practice of Giovanni Battista Ramusio than with the empirical work of Jonas. Ramusio created histories through textual collation rather than direct experience. Hakluyt is interested in the empirical claims of the voyagers, but he presents his information at the very least in a second-hand fashion. A subtle difference between Hakluyt and both Peckham and Jonas is his interest in direct citation. Where Hakluyt is most likely to present full texts directly in *Navigations*, both Peckham and Jonas summarise the arguments they support or oppose, leaving it up to the reader, sometimes through a side note, to ascertain the empirical or textual accuracy of their claims.

---

[5] While Hakluyt at times expressed a willingness to travel to the exotic new world

Jonas' example shows an empirical imperative inasmuch as he uses physical experience to prove Pliny's textual claims. There is a textual element here, but it does not stand on its own; it needs physical, experiential proof for support. But the limits of experiential reality present themselves many times in *Navigations* and in other travel literature. The search for Prester John went on for quite some time, as did the search for a northwest passage; both are examples of theoretical extrapolation producing an external reality. How long does one search for something that does not exist before deciding it is not there? Further, there are contemporary studies that argue that explorers did not simply discover the new world, but in fact created it. In *Imagining the World*, O.R. Dathorn argues that the wealth of textual evidence that preceded explorers' encounters with the new world inevitably controlled the reception of the thing(s) observed. Dathorn points

---

(Taylor, *Hakluyts*, I, 206) he is primarily a collector not a voyager and never does travel to the new world. The only significant trip that he takes is to Paris, staying from October 1583 to July 1584 (D.B. Quinn 1974, 283).

out that most explorers were familiar with Pliny and Mandeville, textual sources that distorted the experience with the indigenous "other" they encountered. Even sources deemed to be more concrete today, like maps, were in a nascent state of development and difficult to understand. Francis Drake, easily the most successful English privateer of the time, often used Spanish and Portuguese maps and individual specialists as pilots to navigate the vast seas. Contemporary scholars such as Mary Baine Campbell and Erica Fudge have made interesting inquiries into the development of taxonomic and linguistic structures for understanding new phenomena in the early modern period. Mary Baine Campbell argues in "Renaissance Voyage Literature and Ethnographic Pleasure: The Case of André Thevet" that early modern travel texts read like ethnographic examples of the mirror stage, where the observer superimposes himself on the body of the native observed. Campbell takes on a rather particular case, André Thevet, whose gift for fabrication was, as we have seen, well documented in the early modern period. Dathorn and Campbell argue a position slightly contrary to Grafton's. Where Grafton suggests that a too full reality over-spilled the boundaries of a given, classical system of classification, Dathorn and Campbell argue an equivalent problem, that an overly prescriptive system of classification limited the thing observed. While the authority need not be classical, Dathorn and Campbell assert that the natural world is a product of discourse, not the other way around. Where Dathorn and Campbell are interested in the ways the discourse distorts external reality, Grafton investigates the moments where reality distorts the discourse.

There is fodder for Dathorn's position in *Navigations*. Anthony Jenkinson finds a unicorn horn (certainly a narwhal horn) "vpon the coast of *Tartaria*" (Hakluyt 1600, 20), tells of an island of women whose men are shaped like dogs (Hakluyt 1598, 58), makes numerous references to Sciopods and Blemmye, and relays one particularly peculiar story wherein amongst realistic monsters – such as alligators – there are other, more exotic creatures: sea horses that walk about on land after dark, and monstrous sea people. In "The trauailes of *Iob Hortop,* which Sir *Iohn Hawkins* set on land within the Bay of *Mexico,* after his departure from the Hauen of *S. Iohn de Vllua* in *Nueua Espanna,* the 8. of October 1568" (Hakluyt 1600, 487), Hortop describes a curious sea creature:

> When we came in the height of *Bermuda,* we discouered a monster in the sea, who shewed himselfe three times vnto vs from the middle vpwards, in which parts hee was proportioned like a man, of the complection of a *Mulato* or tawny Indian. The Generall did commaund one of his clearks to put it in writing, and hee certified the King and his Nobles thereof. Presently after this, for the space of sixteene dayes we had wonderful foule weather, and then God sent vs a faire wind, vntill such time as we discouered the Iland called *Faial.* (Hakluyt 1600, 493)

This is not the only sea moster that Hortob encounters. He describes an earlier experiece where two of the crewmen swimming in a river are "caried away by [a] sea-horse" (Hakluyt 1600, 488). While this is a first-hand account, it is unclear if there is a particular literary influence. It is possible that the creature they describe comes from some classical writer like Pliny or Isodore, but the absence of a clear reference leaves the identity of the creature in doubt. Dathorn's thesis seems reasonable, but it does not account for the surprising and creative recognitions of animals and events that appear to lie outside of written authority. In spite of the fact that the sea man does resemble a number of creatures found in classical texts, the vague description, calling the thing a sea creature rather than a Nereid or merman, shows that what Jenkinson says does not fit into any previous discursive category. Here, textual influence has little effect on the thing observed.

There are many examples of creative description in both foreign and English narratives. In Sir Humphrey Gilbert's voyage north to 'Norumbega' in 1583, Edward Hayes creatively and in great detail describes an encounter with a sea lion:

> So vpon Saturday in the afternoone the 31 of August, we changed our course, and returned backe for *England,* at which very instant, euen in winding about, there passed along betweene vs and towards the land which we now forsooke a very lion to our seeming, in shape, hair and colour, not swimming after the maner of a beast by moouing of his feete, but rather sliding vpon the water with his whole body (excepting the legs) in sight, neither yet diuing vnder, and againe rising aboue the water, as the maner is, of Whales, Dolphins, Tunise, Porposes, and all other fish: but confidently shewing himselfe aboue water without hiding: Notwithstanding, we presented our selues in open view and gesture to amase him, as all creatures will be commonly at a sudden gaze and sight of men. Thus he passed along turning his head to and fro, yawning and gaping wide, with ougly demonstration of long teeth, and glaring eies, and to bidde vs a farewell (comming right against the *Hinde*) he sent forth a horrible voyce, roaring or bellowing as doeth a lion, which spectacle wee all beheld so farre as we were able to discerne the same, as men prone to wonder at euery strange thing, as this doubtlesse was, to see a lion in the Ocean sea, or fish in shape of a lion. What opinion others had thereof, and chiefly the Generall himselfe, I forbeare to deliuer: But he tooke it for

> *Bonum Omen,* reioycing that he was to warre against such an enemie, if it were the deuill. (Hakluyt 1600, 158)

It is clear that the animal Hayes and the crew see is a sea lion, but the way he describes it, without any reference to previous written or known authority, suggests that Hayes has no clear concept of what he sees. Hayes does not refer to Pliny, nor does he make reference to any narrative of a previous voyage. One would assume that if there was a stable narrative reference point for something observed that the voyager would make reference to it. The description is most effective when Hayes uses simile, comparing the attributes of known animals – dolphins, whales, etc. – to the creature he sees. Hayes' description delights in the wonder of this strange creature while at the same time registering a sense of disgust and fear. The animal clearly seems to be dangerous if only in its apparent fearlessness of the ship and its crew. Gilbert's men end up shooting at the sea lion. They fail to hit it, but this textual moment demonstrates that Jonas was right to worry about his land becoming over-exoticized.

There are clearly also moments where the classical authorities are shown to be wrong, and the explorers forced to recognize the disruption of their expectation. Certainly there is an expectation of the marvellous and the savage, but there are narratives that register surprise at how unspectacular certain aspects of the new world are. In his voyage to the new world, José de Acosta writes of how his experience does not line up with certain textual authorities. Hiding below decks in anticipation of the dangers of the 'burning zone,' Acosta emerges to discover the temperature actually cold, and writes of how he laughs at Aristotle's significant error (Acosta 90). The surprising element of

Acosta's confession is his description of the hold classical authority had on him. En route, Acosta debates with himself about the existence and quality of the burning zone, at times dismissing the idea completely and other times suggesting that it cannot possibly exist in the way classical authority has configured it. Acosta enlists the textual aid of Avicenna and Ptolemy (89-91), suggesting that they both knew that the burning zone is inhabitable. He reasons that the burning zone should in fact be habitable, temperate, and rainy, but once his ship draws close he cannot help himself and hides below decks. Acosta laughs both at the inaccuracy of the classics and also at his own foolishness, a fear that grips him in spite of his reasoned position. *Navigations* similarly includes moments when classical authority is disrupted or called into question. George Best follows Acosta's example to some extent, similarly theorizing that the burning zone is likely habitable. Best writes of "Experiences and reasons of the Sphere, to prooue all partes of the worlde habitable, and thereby to confute the position of the fiue Zones" (Hakluyt 1600, 48). It is significant that he mentions both experience and reason as methods for proof, suggesting that neither can stand on its own. Of his experience Best writes:

> *Aquarius* the 9. of Ianuary, hauing South latitude, I am to prooue by experience and reason, that all that distance included betweene these two Paralels last named (conteyning 40. degrees in latitude, going round about the earth, according to longitude) is not onely habitable, but the same most fruitfull and delectable, and that if any extremitie of heate bee, the same not to be within the space of twenty degrees of the Equinoctiall on either side, but onely vnder and about the two Tropickes, and so proportionally the neerer you doe approch to eyther Tropicke,

> the more you are subiect to extremitie of heate (if any such be) and so *Marochus* being situate but sixe or seuen degrees from the Tropicke of *Cancer,* shall be more subiect to heate, then any place vnder or neere the Equinoctiall line. (Hakluyt 1600, 48)

This is not as dramatic as Acosta's discovery, but Best's theoretical assumptions do fly in the face of much of accepted classical authority about the torrid zone. Here Best is dedicated to proving his point through the double-fisted attack of experience and reason. There is no direct reference to classical authorities, but it is likely that reason is drawn in part from textual representation.

Recourse to psychoanalytic thinking is helpful here. A fundamental task of clinical psychoanalytic practice is to find ways of coping with the phantasmatic, or the unreal, and to some degree explain how it becomes represented. The amount of factual play within *Navigations* points to a deeper meaning of fact, where fact becomes something that is believed, regardless of whether the thing observed exists or not. Very few ventures to North America returned without a reference to cannibals, something that was governed more through expectation than experience. Sebastian Cabot tells voyagers after him (These directions are specifically directed to Hugh Willoughby for his 1553 voyage to Cathay) what to expect of the natives of the new world:

> there are people that can swimme in the sea, havens, & rivers, naked, having bowes and shafts, coveting to draw nigh your ships, which if they shal finde not wel watched, or warded, they will assault, desirous of the bodies of men, which they covet for meate: if you resist them, they dive, and so will flee, and therefore diligent watch is to be kept both day & night, in some Islands. (Hakluyt 1598, 229)

Cabot describes the native as deviously aggressive but outwardly cowardly, a creature with a desire to consume human flesh but without the courage to confront the object of desire directly. Cabot's depiction of the native other is misrepresentative, but it forcefully lays out a course of action for the European traveller. Cabot urges Europeans to watch for indigenous deception, and to present clearly a position of strength. Cabot's assertion of indigenous cannibalism, like many similar early modern claims, is supported by assumption and supposition rather than observable fact. There are a number of moments where European texts claim native deception. Martin Frobisher has five members of his crew captured by Inuit people, and in future meetings with Inuit people inquires whether they have in fact been eaten (Hakluyt 1600, 68). There are also countless stories of indigenous deception, but there is no hard evidence in any English travel narrative to the new world that proves the existence of indigenous cannibals. Most arguments for indigenous cannibalism rely on very thin evidence indeed. Martin Frobisher never witnesses any cannibal act, but his revulsion at witnessing Inuit people eating raw seal meat prompts him to metonymically connect this practice with a desire for human flesh. Frobisher's revulsion comes with a rather delicious irony (pardon the pun). The Inuit people were able to stave off scurvy without any citrus because of the vitamin C in raw seal meat, a benefit lost in the cooking. Had early English explorers followed Inuit culinary practices, they would have staved off scurvy, and the unfortunate national epithet 'limey'. The loss of his crewmen, and his subsequent discovery of their "apparell and English furniture which was found in their tents" (Hakluyt 1600, 70) fuel further speculation, but the indigenous people he later encounters stiffly deny eating his men.

In this way, many of the narratives of discovery express elements of a psychosis: stories that are not factually correct still have the power to construct a position and govern action. The problem of perception, whether generated by textual precedents or not, also raises a bigger problem to the analyst than simply stating that the perception is incorrect or misrepresentative. It would be a rather poor psychoanalytic session if a patient, complaining of voices telling him to burn things, were told by the analyst that there was no such voices and that he should simply stop all his foolishness and go home. In each case, what is at stake is the stability of the sign. The discovery of a narwal horn as proof of the existence of unicorns is an assumption that eventually passes, and Hakluyt's text can be read as demonstrating the trajectory of this development.

What is Hakluyt doing with texts?

Hakluyt's position as editor in *Navigations* is peculiar. He is at once adjacent to but not quite identical with author, editor, and compiler. At times he wears each one of these hats, and other times he disappears, or at least claims to. He is set within a tradition of sorts, but one that sits uneasily on him. *Navigations* loosely follows a template initiated by Spanish collectors. As early as 1507 Fracanzio of Montalboddo published a collection of voyages that bears many similarities to *Navigations* (or vice versa), a relatively small project followed by a much larger one by Giovanni Batista Ramusio (Rubiés 154). In "Instructions for Travellers: Teaching the Eye to See," Joan-Pau Rubiés suggests that

> Giovanni Battista Ramusio published the first volume of his *Delle navigationi et viaggi*, a serious attempt to compile, organize and provide a critical edition of all the important travel accounts then available. Ramusio participated in the development of a new geographical science based on systematically updating the best classical sources through comparison with recent reports. (156)

If Ramusio really was unencumbered by nationalistic or political interests, it is clear that his English imitators usually did not share this value-free position. Richard Eden, a problematic precursor to Hakluyt, compiles a text that differs from Ramusio in its intent and selectivity. Eden's texts *The Decades of the Newe World* (a translation of Pietro Martire d' Anghierra's *De Orbe Novo*), and *A Treatyse of the Newe India* (a translation of Sebastian Munster's *Cosmographia*) are published in 1555 and 1553 respectively. Eden's translation of Spanish and Portuguese voyages and his praise of their discoveries and conquests is designed to encourage the English to follow suit, a thing he makes clear in his introduction. Eden also does not always include the complete text. Of the ten 'decades' of Pietro Martire de Anghiera's *De Orbe Novo* Eden publishes only three.

While Hakluyt does include some lengthy sections of translated texts, and some of Eden's collection is reprinted in *Navigations*, he is generally concerned with English, rather than foreign, narratives. Many of the texts which Hakluyt translated into English are English narratives, decrees, and patent letters written in Latin. He also suggests that he does not excerpt any narrative where the entire text is available. Hakluyt's interest in primarily English narratives is often used to emphasize his nationalistic interests. This assessment tends to downplay the amount of foreign text actually in *Navigations* (around 20% of the book consists of foreign sources). Where Hakluyt shares a national interest with Ramusio and Montalboddo, his collection differs in scope. *Navigations* covers a more distant history – at times bordering on myth – as well as the new discoveries of English travel, whereas Ramusio was interested in the past few centuries only. Hakluyt's method allows for a broader study of the origins of English travel and history, reproducing a version of the myth of Madoc, and recovering "A testimonie out of the fourteenth Booke of the Annales of Cornelius Tacitus, proouing London to haue bene a famous Mart Towne in the reigne of Nero the Emperour, which died in the yeere of Christ 70" (Hakluyt 1598, 124).

By focussing on English narratives, Hakluyt reveals a nationalistic interest, but he largely prints texts not in circulation, extending the historical scope of his study beyond collectors like Ramusio. He also includes some more eloquent, and at times false, historical narratives. It is clear that Hakluyt was in possession of Ramusio's *Viaggi*, and a significant portion of the 1589 volume of *Navigations* was taken up by the questionable narratives of Mandeville. And while reference to Frisius and Munster as authorities do show up in *Navigations*, there is considerable evidence of an urge to amend these authorities. Jonas and Nicols are good examples of this sort of writing back, and in the introduction to the 1598 volume Hakluyt significantly mentions Jonas and his attack on "historiographers and Cosmographers of later times, as namely, *Munster, Gemma Frisius, Zieglerus, Krantzius, Saxo Grammaticus, Olaus Magnus, Peucerus* and others" (Hakluyt 1598, **3v). While Hakluyt's text shows a willingness to challenge and overturn classical authorities, they are not abandoned completely. There are moments when early cosmographers are cited as authorities to prove specific points. In a work designed to argue that the Northwest Passage was possible, Humphrey Gilbert enlists the authority of Gemma Frisius and others:

> Wherefore I am of opinion that *America* by the Northwest will be found fauourable to this our enterprise, and am the rather imboldened to beleeue the same, for that I finde it not onely confirmed by *Plato, Aristotle,* and other ancient Phylosophers: but also by all the best moderne Geographers, as *Gemma Frisius,*

> *Munsterus, Appianus, Hunterus, Gastaldus, Guyccardinus, Michael Tramasinus, Franciscus Demongenitus, Bernardus Pureanus, Andreas Vauasor, Tramontanus, Petrus Martyr,* and also *Ortelius,* who doth coast out in his generall Mappe set out *Anno 1569,* all the countreys and Capes, on the Northwest side of *America,* from *Hohelaga* to *Cape de Paramania:* describing likewise the sea coastes of *Cataia* and *Gronland,* towards any part of *America,* making both *Gronland* and *America, Islands* disioyned by a great sea, from any part of *Asia.* (Hakluyt 1600, 10).

Hakluyt demonstrates a shift in what constitutes authority, excising Thevet and Ingram for instance, but he still includes narratives that cite problematic histories. At the very least textual authority is complicated, with a reader understanding the potentially problematical writing of earlier authoritative narratives.

Unlike the moribund chronicle tradition that Woolf says breathes its last in the seventeenth century, the style of collection of Hakluyt's *Navigations* spawns several imitators. Samuel Purchas is the immediate successor to Richard Hakluyt, who publishes *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas his Pilgrims* in 1625. Hakluyt's influence extended out of England to France, where Melchisédech Thévenot spends nine years printing a "four-volume travel compilation [titled] *Relations de Divers Voyages Curieux*" (Dew 39) from 1663 to 1672. The very different projects of Eden, Hakluyt, Ramusio, and Montalboddo fracture the practice of the ancients somewhat, endorsing Woolf's assertion that more modern historians "emulated the practice of the ancients without stealing their material" (Woolf, Erudition 14). These modern, humanist historians are responsible for eloquent and "classic histories [such] as Bacon's *Henry VII*, Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, and Burnet's *History of his Own Times*" (Woolf, "Erudition" 14). Thevet, Munster, and Mandeville are also eloquent writers of history, but they are authorities who face stern criticism from within *Navigations*. Thevet, Frisus and Munster are referenced as authoritaties in *Navigations*, usually in arguments constructed to prove the existence of the Northwest Passage. Both Richard Willes (Hankluyt 1600, 24-29) and Humphrey Gilbert (Hakluyt 1600, 11-24) cite Frisus and Thevet in their arguments for the existence of the Northwest Passage, along with a host of other classical and more recent historians and cosmographers. *Navigations* also includes *The Catalogue of the Great Masters*, reprinted from Munster's *Cosmographia Universalis* (Hakluyt 1598, 144-148). While Woolf suggests that history in early modern England generally followed the chronicle or humanist methodology, it appears that Hakluyt in fact participates to some degree in both. There certainly are elements of the chronicle in *Navigations*, although the book is not a chronicle, and there are also eloquent and at times potentially distorted histories as well, although the book is not a work of fiction. The inclusion of both makes one question the other, and often there are moments where authority contained within the text is questioned. Some texts within *Navigations* set up Thevet, Munster and others as authorities only to call their authority into question later. While each of these elements has been used as a reason to criticize or dismiss Hakluyt's contribution, these are not moments of weakness, but rather *Navigations'* great strength.

Editorial Influence

Aside from the dedications and epistles, Hakluyt's editorial voice appears only sporadically, making reference to what should be carried along on voyages, what should be brought back and observed, and occasionally how to observe. This is a break from the trajectory Richard Eden sets out. Eden often glosses and introduces the texts he reprints throughout the sixteenth century. Hakluyt is also at times reflexive of his own editorial practice, citing his own and others' instructions to various voyagers. Often there are letters and requests for information from learned friends, and mercantile interests from connected investors. Gerard Mercator, for instance, wants Charles Jackman and Arthur Pet to bring back cartographical information from their voyage to the north east (Hakluyt

1598, 272). And on numerous occasions interested parties suggest that voyagers keep an eye out for potential economic opportunities both agricultural and mercantile (Hakluyt 1598, 432). Hakluyt is not a transparent conduit of travel narratives, but he does appear to resist textual manipulation. *Navigations* is a text in which multiple editorial voices are present, voices from high culture (like Peckham) and voices of experience (like Jenkinson and Frobisher). From the voyage of Humphrey Gilbert, for instance (see below 182), present is the voice of experience in Edward Hayes' account of the voyage, and the voice of high culture in George Gascoigne's introduction and marginalia to his printed version of the text in 1577. Hakluyt's editorial intervention arises here as well, as he omits this introduction in the printed version of Hayes' narrative. And while this sort of multiplicity suggests the absence of authority, where competing narratives contradict and undermine, it is precisely within that struggle that authority arises.

In the first significant collection of travel texts that he compiles, Hakluyt presents himself as an impartial collector of travel narratives rather than a writer of them. Whenever possible, Hakluyt includes the source of the text, translator or compiler, and the text in its original language. Hakluyt takes this to an extreme, stating in almost every piece of front matter that he has not altered the narratives he has collected in any way. In the preface to the first edition of *Principal Navigations* he states that

> Whatsoever Testimonie I have found in any authour of authoritie appertaining to my argument, either stranger or naturall, I have recorded the same word for word, with his particular name and page of the booke where it is extant. If the same were not reduced to our common language, I have first expressed it in the same terms wherein it is originally written. (Hakluyt 1589, *4v)

Hakluyt's claimed fidelity to the source text hints at an understanding of the effect of original language and the potential impact of the editor on the text. His program here is similar to many contemporary bilingual editions of translated texts that include the original text alongside the translation. Some are early documents and relatively short, like "The voyage of Bertus, generall of an armie sent into Ireland by Ecfridus king of Northumberland, in the yere of our Lord 684" (Hakluyt 1598, 4), and others are more recent and invoke Latin as the language of international commerce and politics, as with "The answere of her Maiestie to the aforesaid Letters of the Great Turke, sent the 25 of October 1579, in the Prudence of London by Master Richard Stanley" (Hakluyt 1599: sec I, 138-140). This does not write Hakluyt completely out of the equation, and thus remove him from any culpability for the success or failure of the text, but it limits his impact. In some ways, Hakluyt's method of collection is designed to line up with the ideal method of observation and collection employed by the explorers themselves. Hakluyt explains this editorial decision, asserting that he wishes to make "every man . . . answer for himself, justifie his reports, and stand accountable for his owne doings" (Hakluyt 1589, *4v). As mentioned in the introduction, he repeats this sentiment in the preface to the second edition, saying it would be "more convenient that himself [the voyager] should speak, then that I should bee his spokesman" (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, *7v). The interesting thing about the truth claims of *Navigations* is that Hakluyt never makes any. Instead he lets the narrators make their own claims to truth. We can see here that Hakluyt, rather than working to present an objective view, is in fact doing the opposite. He is not collecting texts of objective historical and social reality but rather texts that are contingent and subjective. By drawing attention to the subjective quality of each narrative and their respective claims to truth, he displaces objective knowledge and himself as an arbiter of it. This editorial move demands responsibility from the explorer rather than the compiler. It is hard to think of this as an attempt to present the objectivity of social and physical reality. If this is a project in search of an objective voice, it is an utter failure, because the very attempt to show the world as objective achieves its opposite, showing external reality to be subjective and unstable. The beauty of this is that any assumption that this destabilization is *Navigations'* Achilles heel, that this multiplicity weakens the authority of the text, is off the mark. It is this very destabilization that is *Navigations'* most convincing quality, its greatest strength.

In opposition to Hakluyt's suggestion that he does not change any of the texts he collects stands a rather large body of scholarship. Numerous studies have shown that Hakluyt excerpted and altered several of the texts in *Navigations* (Coote 35-80), Simmons 161-67, Lach 219). The two volumes of *The Hakluyt Handbook* cite numerous moments where Hakluyt adds or subtracts from the text. In spite of this, M.F. Strachan at least suggests that by and large Hakluyt was a conscientious editor (Strachan 215). Germane to any discussion of Hakluyt's omissions or emendations is the question why Hakluyt excerpts some texts, emends others, while at time punctiliously adhering to his stated mandate. J.S.G. Simmons observes that Hakluyt "was giving his readers less than the full story" (Simmons 165) when transcribing Giles Fletcher's *Russe Commonwealth*. Simmons' assertion that Hakluyt was interested in editing out any of the anti-Russian elements of Fletcher's text leaves unexplained the presence of anti-Russian writing elsewhere in *Navigations*, something Simmons himself acknowledges (Simmons 166). There are many texts in *Navigations* that could be construed as anti-Russian. One of the more vitriolic texts comes from George Turbervile who writes three letters in verse designed to "describe the maners of the Countrey and people" (Hakluyt 1598, 384) of Russia (see below 92). There is little that redeems the Russians in Turbervile's text, and its inclusion in *Navigations* throws into question the assertion that Hakluyt was dedicated to editing out anti-Russian rhetoric.

There can be no doubt that Hakluyt's suggestion that he does not alter any of the texts he collects is untrue. One avenue that has yet to be sufficiently explored is the other ways Hakluyt as editor exerts control over the texts he collects. Hakluyt configures himself as a disinterested collector, unconcerned with interpreting the text. His claimed mandate is to reprint texts for others to interpret. But there is something in the scaffolding of collection that cannot escape an interest in meaning. There are certain poorly written texts in *Navigations* that cry out for editorial intervention, but Hakluyt more than resists: he suggests that they are important not in spite of the poor writing, but in part because of it. Hakluyt includes *Libell of English Policie*, a 15th -century text that encourages England to develop foreign trade:

> For indeed the exteriour habit of this our *English* politician, to wit, the harsh and vnaffected stile of his substantiall verses and the olde dialect of his worde is such; as the first may seeme to haue bene whistled of *Pans* oaten pipe, and the second to haue proceeded from the mother of *Euander:* but take you off his vtmost weed, and beholde the comelinesse, beautie, and riches which lie hid within his inward sense and sentence; and you shall finde (I wisse) so much true and sound policy, so much delightfull and pertinent history, so many liuely descriptions of the shipping and wares in his time of all the nations almost in Christendome, and such a subtile discouery of outlandish merchants fraud, and of the sophistication of their wares; that needes you must acknowledge, that more matter and substance could in no wise be comprised in so little a roome. And notwithstanding (as I said) his stile be vnpolished, and his phrases somewhat out of vse; yet, so neere as the written copies would giue me leaue, I haue most religiously without alteration obserued the same. (Hakluyt 1599: sec II *7v)

Hakluyt suggests that there is value in the style and form of older writing. He points to the off-putting style of the medieval text but also asserts its value and honesty. There is some inward quality to the text and the writing – something that escapes or adds to the explicitly informative quality – that compensates for the outward difficulties. Hakluyt also points to the material limitations of the text, suggesting that perhaps the brevity of the text contributes to the cumbersome style.

Hakluyt's assertion lends particular insight into his historical and national positioning. While this passage suggests that there are different, and in some respects better, ways of writing something, he also suggests that so called poor writing has a particular value. Suggesting that there is something of value in the rough and unskilled writing of Chancellor, Hakluyt does the double work of charting a developmental trajectory of English eloquence by pointing to its historically shifting qualities *and* its constancy. There may be more outwardly eloquent writers at the moment of *Navigations'* publication, but there are inward qualities of certain earlier English narratives that more than belie the imperfections of style and the oddity of dialect. It is the "harsh and vnaffected stile" that holds a special sort of meaning not found in contemporary histories. Here Hakluyt not only urges the reader to proceed with a narrative of acknowledged difficulty, but urges the reader to see in it some quality that is inherently valuable because of its problematic style.

As with *Libell*, Hakluyt acknowledges that there are foreign texts that are important but may be a bit strange to the contemporary reader. In the introduction to the 1598 volume of *Navigations*, Hakluyt points to the quirks of historical trajectory:

> these two relations containe in some respect more exact history of those vnknowen parts, then all the ancient and newe writers that euer I could set mine eyes on: I thought it good, if the translation should chance to swerue in ought from the originals (both for the preseruation of the originals themselues, and the satisfying of the Reader) to put them downe word for word in that homely stile wherein they were first penned. (Hakluyt 1598, *8v)

The narratives Hakluyt refers to here come from two foreign religious men, Johannes de Plano Carpini, a Roman monk, and William of Rubruck, a Flemish monk. Hakluyt does leave the original Latin text unchanged, but he also includes updated English versions of these two manuscripts. Here again Hakluyt suggests that there is something in the way that certain writers express themselves that, if tampered with, affects the meaning. Nevertheless, Hakluyt does include multiple translations of the text, a tactic that opens up a field of cross-references and allows a wider readership access to the text. Not only can the learned man fluent in Latin read and compare the texts, but because of the modernized English translation, any literate person is granted access to history otherwise closed. Hakluyt is also careful to point out that there are limits to these texts stylistically, but that there is something of value in spite of the "homely stile" in which they are written.

Hakluyt's influence as an editor and compiler has an effect on the text in ways other than textual manipulation. He demonstrates in several places that he does not find instructing the voyager on what and how to observe a corruptive influence. As I have mentioned earlier, Louis De Vorsey Jr. has commented on Hakluyt's colonial investment and his interest in drumming up interest in overseas expansion and development. This interest is most clearly described in *Discourse of Western Planting*, but it is not absent from *Navigations*. *Discourse of Western Planting* outlines Hakluyt's complicated plan for English expansion to the new world, a plan that would solve both England's problems of population growth and market shortages. Hakluyt saw a developmental potential of the new world that could succeed only if undertaken on an immense scale. According to Quinn and Quinn, *the Discourse* claimed that the development of the new world held many benefits for the English nation. North America could serve as a new place to export English textiles, as exports that used to go to European countries like Spain and Russia (after the death of Ivan IV) had dried up (Quinn and Quinn, *Discourse* xxiii). Hakluyt also suggested that the new world was a place for employment of masterless men, and the employment gained in settling of the new world would dissuade English men from acts of piratism (Quinn and Quinn, xxiv). Not afraid to play on well-established sympathies, Hakluyt places "the Church's part in the English penetration of North America at the forefront of his treatise … a topic dear to the queen's heart" (Quinn and Quinn, *Discourse* xxiii). While Hakluyt here seems to be slightly idealistic in some of his assertions – he greatly underestimates the effect which the colonial project will have on indigenous peoples and gets the climatic picture wrong – he recognizes that the "initial costs of colonialism would be high and that the results in economic terms would be slow to achieve" (Quinn and Quinn, *Discourse* xxviii).

The inclusion of certain narratives that open a window to violence, like Peckham's invocation of Ingram above, suggests that Hakluyt understood that violence on some level was probable. But he also includes instructions that urge a softer interaction with the indigenous people. Hakluyt was more interested in trading with the inhabitants of the new world than displacing them. In a letter to Arthur Pet and Charles Jackman before their 1580 voyage to discover the north eastern strait, Hakluyt includes instructions given by his cousin Richard Hakluyt the elder, suggesting what the two explorers should bring along and what they should bring back. Most of these instructions are linked to commodity interests, or give advice about how to exploit trade and commerce, but he shows his more moderate position towards the indigenous people, should they find any:

> for if you finde the soyle planted with people, it is like that in time an ample vent of our warme wollen clothes may be found. And if there be no people at all there to be found, then you shall specially note what plentie of whales, and of other fish is to be found there, to the ende we may turne our newe found land fishing or Island fishing, or our whale fishing that

> way, for the ayde and comfort of our newe trades to the Northeast to the coasts of *Asia*. (Hakluyt 1598, 438)

The question here is one of either extraction or export, asking voyagers to look for possible markets for English goods or discover commodities abroad that can be exploited. While this is not an egalitarian view – certainly Hakluyt would be interested in buying cheap and selling dear –he shows no interest in displacing the natives for the value of the land they possess.

It is certain that Hakluyt was not blind to the economic possibilities of the new world, and understood his work as a way to further his private financial interests and as a calling card to attract a profitable position from a wealthy patron. Hakluyt consistently demonstrates that he is capable of securing both. Hakluyt's most significant patron of the early years was Sir Francis Walsingham, whose support sends him to Paris to research the possibility of trade routes and plantation in the Americas for "the publike benefit of this Realme" (Hakluyt 1582, *3r), and to serve as "chaplain to the embassy" (Quinn and Quinn, *Discourse* xvi). This is the patronage that makes *Navigations* possible (Quinn, *Handbook* 314, and Mancall 211). Walsingham dies in 1590, but Hakluyt finds support from Lord Howard of Effingham, and the Countess of Sheffield (Lady Douglas Stafford) from 1590 to 1603. Hakluyt was instituted as rector of Wetheringsett with Blockford in Suffolk and subsequently also became rector of Gedney at Lincolnshire in 1612 (Quinn, *Handbook* 303-4, 326). Hakluyt also received considerable support from Robert Cecil, to whom he dedicates the second edition of *Navigations*.

The publication of *A Discourse of Western Planting* earned Hakluyt the favour and patronage of the Queen, and *Navigations,* in spite of a lukewarm response from the Queen, brought an appointment at Westminster and an advisory position with the East India Company. The mercantile interests are not the only elements that drive the book, and neither are they the single interest of Hakluyt. Hakluyt urges the voyagers to "bring home besides certain merchandize certaine trifles" (Hakluyt 1598, 439). Hakluyt's idea of a trifle has rather broad boundaries as he asks them to "Bring home with you (if you may) from Cambalu or other civil place, one or other yong man, although you leave one for him" (Hakluyt 1598, 439). It is hard to imagine what sort of economic benefit might come from and exchange of young men, there could be anthropological and cultural reasons for the practice, and an interest in understanding the culture they are dealing with. He also asks for "the seeds of all strange herbs & flowers, for such seeds of fruits and herbs comming from another part of the world, and so far off, will delight the fansie of many for the strangenesse, and for that the same may grow, and continue the delight long time" (Hakluyt 1598, 439). The interest here is less in extraction or export than it is in learning and aesthetics. The purpose of these 'trifles' is that their value lies outside of economic or colonial interests, expressing an interest in knowledge for the sake of knowledge and a focus upon the strange and the delightful.

Instruction does not only come from Hakluyt. There were many people interested in the protocol of exploration or interested in the opportunities exploration provided, and some who were simply passing on good advice. Hugh Willoughby is given instructions from Sebastian Cabot in 1553 (Hakluyt 1598, 226), the governors and assistants of the Muscovy company give instructions to Anthony Jenkinson in 1561 (Hakluyt 1598, 341), and Thomas Randolfe is given instructions for his exploratory voyage to the north east in 1588. For Willoughby's voyage of 1553 to Cathay, Sebastian Cabot presents a detailed abstract consisting of 33 'Items' indicating how a successful voyage should be conducted, what it should accomplish, and how it should be documented (Hakluyt 1598, 439). Most of the list outlines rather predictable requirements – that the sailors be honest and loyal to the captain and he in turn remain loyal to the monarch – but there are a few that discuss the nature of what should be brought back from the new world and how this will be documented. Item seven gives interesting insight into the practices of narrative and historical construction:

> that the marchants, and other skilful persons in writing, shal daily write, describe, and put in memorie the Nauigation of euery day and night, with the points, and obseruation of the lands, tides, elements, altitude of the sunne, course of the moon and starres, and the same so noted by the order of the Master and pilot of euery ship to be put in writing, the captaine generall assembling the masters together once euery weeke (if winde and weather shal serue) to conferre all the obseruations, and notes of the said ships, to the intent it may appeare wherein the notes do agree, and wherein they dissent, and vpon good debatement, deliberation, and conclusion determined, to put the same into a common leger, to remain of record for the company: the like order to be kept in proportioning of the Cardes, Astrolabes, and other instruments prepared for the voyage, at the charge of the companie. (Hakluyt 1598, 226)

The instructions are rather straightforward, suggesting that everyone who is a skilful writer should write down what they experience and see. But Cabot is not suggesting that they will come back with multiple narratives, but that all those who write something down should 'deliberate' and 'determine' what narrative to present. Surely this is an expression of the problem of observing and recording objective reality, showing the manifold nature of observation and expression as well as the mediative force of language. Cabot's instructions imply that the fullness of the world lies beyond the scope of one perspective, that multiple perspectives will present a better picture of actual events. He also implies that the discourse itself needs boundaries, that discussion and debate are needed to present an authoritative text. The objective world does not simply present itself to a single person or several people, but also needs argument and deliberation to be fully expressed. This also seems in part to govern Hakluyt's principal of compilation, as he includes diverse and often very different texts for *Navigations*. It would appear that in the same way that reality does not present itself clearly and uniformly to the observer, narrative also does not present reality clearly and uniformly to the reader. In each case a process, or discourse, is set out to best capture the object of representation. If there was one way to state something, then only one person would be required to observe and chronicle the observation. By asking for multiple voices, Cabot asserts, and Hakluyt endorses the inaccuracy of a single perspective while asserting that these seemingly singular, linear narratives in fact come from a multiplicity of sources.

Interesting in this section is that the consensus agreed upon would likely not represent any real eyewitness account. Although the term and practice would not arrive for some centuries, Cabot's instructions produce a text in a similar way that stemmatic rescention editing does, while Hakluyt's project is similar to eclectic editing. In Cabot's version of events there are multiple source texts which in turn produce a best text that would not conform to any of the manuscripts. This collation also complicates the idea that early modern travel narratives are 'miming' the voice of the lower classes. The requirement of writing skill eliminates all but those who are relatively well educated, and in the end, it is the captain who constructs an official account out of the various narratives. While there may be no editing after the text gets into the hands of Hakluyt, the final script is edited in advance, and the final text that is produced is an amalgamation of many different voices directed from several different places. What is clear is that the difference in perspective and debate that precedes the final text is effaced in the end product. The reality that is portrayed in the final text is a reality that was not experienced by any single person; it is a reality that exists in discourse as much as experience. While this moment does efface elements of narrative, Hakluyt's project does preserve difference, which produces a text that is multiple and fluid at the same time. The text is fluid in the sense that there are absences that are foregrounded, absences that the text deliberately presents unresolved. There are also moments, as I will discuss below, where difference is presented starkly, which in turn demonstrates *Navigations* to be a multiple text.

On Jackman and Pet's voyage to Cathay in 1580, William Burrough gives instruction in a somewhat different manner. He asks them not just to write down what they measure through sounding but also to describe what they see, and not only with text but by drawing:

> When you come to haue sight of any coast or land whatsoeuer, doe you presently set the same with your sailing Compasse, howe it beares off you, noting your iudgement how farre you thinke it from you, drawing also the forme of it in your booke, howe it appeares vnto you, noting diligently how the highest or notablest part thereof beareth off you, and the extreames also in sight of the same land at both ends, distinguishing them by letters, A. B.C. &c. Afterwards when you haue sailed I. 2. 3. or 4. glasses (at the most) noting diligently what way your barke hath made, and vpon what point of the Compasse, do you againe set that first land seene, or the parts thereof, that you first obserued, if you can well perceiue or discerne them, and likewise such other notable points or signes, vpon the land that you may then see, and could not perciue at the first time, distinguishing it also by letters from the other, and drawing in your booke the shape of the same land, as it appeareth vnto you, and so the third time, &c. (Hakluyt 1598, 436)

Thomas Randolf gives similar instructions, stating that explorers should "alwayes use to draw the proportion and biting of the land, aswell the lying out of the points, and headlands, unto the which you shall give some apt names (at your discretion) as also the forme of the Bayes" (Hakluyt 1598, 384). Here Randolf addresses the limitations of language by asking for drawings rather than description. Both advisors foreground the subjective aspect of observation as well, Burrough asking the explorer to use his 'judgement' and Randolf imploring, "omit not to note any thing that may be sensible and apparant to you, which may serue to any purpose." (Hakluyt 1598, 384). The recourse to the explorer's judgement asserts the limitations of the advice and of the explorer. It is not possible, and perhaps not desirable, to write everything down. What one comes back with is necessarily piecemeal, a subjective piece of an objective puzzle. This duplicates Cabot's instructions, pointing to the limitations of observation and narrative, and implies the participation of multiple narratives.

There are several narratives where the learned lend their expertise to the voyage, and there are requests from them as well. Hakluyt writes to Gerard Mercator asking him what he knows and what he would like to know, offering him an opportunity to explore through Arthur Pet and Charles Jackman. Hakluyt does not receive the information Mercator sends in time, and so ultimately his interests go unfulfilled, but Hakluyt includes his interests in *Navigations* nonetheless (Hakluyt 1598, 444). Mercator, famous for constructing the first projection map capable of depicting the then known world, is interested primarily in cartography, but would also like to know tide movements and times, and, although he is too late to get this information from Pet, his letter shows what potential future voyages could observe (this is Hakluyt 1598, 443-445). Mercator's interest and influence on the construction of travel narratives and upon Hakluyt himself are significant not only in the requests he presents to Hakluyt, but the position he holds as a kind of cartographical authority. In answering a few of Hakluyt's questions, Mercator demonstrates an affinity between the construction of cartographical knowledge and historical texts:

> Concerning the gulfe of *Merosro* and *Canada,* and new *France* which are in my mappes, they were taken out of a certaine sea card drawn by a

> certaine priest out of the description of a Frenchman, Pilot very skilfull in those partes, and presented to the worthy prince *George* of *Austria,* bishop of *Liege:* for the trending of the coast, and the eleuation of the pole, I doubt not but they are very neere the trueth: for the Charte had beside a scale of degrees of latitude passing through the middest of it, another particularly annexed to the coast of *New France,* wherewith the errour of the latitudes committed by reason of the variation of the compasse might be corrected. (Hakluyt 1598, 445)

Mercator is not necessarily looking for new information, but corroborating evidence. This type of repetition is paradoxically an example of ontological uncertainty *and* consistency. Like the editorial recommendations from Cabot, this corroborative interest is designed to iron out the contradictions of historical narrative, but signals an uncertainty about the information already in his possession. With Cabot's instructions, this anxiety is located at an individual level, where the information directly experienced by the voyager is somewhat in doubt.

In each of the above-mentioned cases, the authority for the text comes from a different social or physical space. There are those with academic (or writerly) expertise who write history (or influence its writing), those who use texts to produce external reality, as well as those who use supposedly empirical methods to uncover it. There are also moments of mime (see below 88), where authorities mimic a common voice. But there are also authentic common voices, voices from the field, which, as often as not, amalgamate to find an authoritative text. History and ontology, according to *Navigations*, are not hard objective facts, things that only need a proper way of seeing to be understood and a proper method of representation to be recorded. *Navigations* demonstrates that history has multiple writers and editors, each participating in an elaborate construction. Every contributor has a role to play in constructing a history that is at once subjective and objective: objective in the sense that often the history of an event is not experienced by any single voyager, and subjective in the sense that various individual experience contributes to historical construction. *Navigations* shows that history is not a uniform, static production, but is fluid and vibrant. The inclusion of multiple perspectives, the instructions to travellers, and the various forms shows history to be a rich manifold tapestry.

Desire is the Actual essence of man

Baruch Spinoza

Chapter II

The General Desire of the Realm: Who Reads Hakluyt and How?

In an article for the *Westminster Review* of July 1852, James Anthony Froude commented that Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* was "the great prose epic of the English nation" (Froude 187). This comment reflects mid-nineteenth-century nationalist thinking, attributing to Hakluyt a seminal position in England's national development. Since then other critics have followed suit, treating Hakluyt's *Navigations* and several other of his works (most often his *Discourse of Western Planting*) as key texts in the construction of English empire. Louis De Vorsey Jr, in "Richard Hakluyt: Elizabethan Voice of Discovery" suggests that

> in 1582, Hakluyt brought out the first of his many publications designed to shake the English from their lethargy in the arena of overseas expansion and colony building. Titled, *Divers Voyages Touching the Discoverie of America*, it aimed at putting on record all that was available to Englishmen describing eastern north America, beginning with King Henry VII's Patent to John Cabot and carrying through to Ribaut's accounts of Florida. (De Vorsey Jr. 8)

De Vorsey suggests that the texts that follow, including *Western Planting* and the three volumes of *Principal Navigations,* carry on very particular nationalistic work supporting overseas expansion. There can be no question that Hakluyt was interested in developing the new world, and the most significant part that *Navigations* plays in this development is its interest in bettering sea navigation. The overtly didactic elements of *Navigations* need little aesthetic polish to be useful, and because of this lack of polish in many sections, the assessment of *Navigations* as a great prose epic has come under fire. Hakluyt's motivation for leaving some texts in a raw state is reasonable on a number of levels. It maintains a fidelity to his stated mandate to leave texts alone and suggests a particular valuation in different, sometimes difficult language. Nevertheless, Hakluyt's position as empire builder hinges at least partially on the affect of his texts, and *Navigations* is more than a mere instructional manual. And while Froude's notion of epic may have shifted over the years, Hakluyt's text must have been pleasing on an Imperial or aesthetic level for him to make such a suggestion. This chapter will investigate the ways in which critics have read *Navigations*, what Hakluyt wanted to accomplish with the text, and whether there is any room to salvage this text as an artistic presentation of history.

Froude's assessment of *Navigations* went relatively unchallenged for over a century, until the early 1970's when George C. Parks, in "Tudor Travel Literature: A Brief History," puts Froude's assertion to an aesthetic test. Parks investigated the individual narratives in *Navigations* to ascertain their literariness. For Parks, the whole must be equal to the sum of its parts, and the evidence for *Navigations* as prose epic lay in the cumulative effect of the individual narratives. Parks reads *Navigations* what he feels are Froude's literary terms, and while he acknowledges that there are some interesting narratives within *Navigations,* of a quality that could comfortably be called literature, most simply do not measure up. After praising Hakluyt's immense achievement of collecting several hundred narratives, very few of which were previously printed, he concludes that,

> We must admit that the two hundred narratives, or the one hundred and fifteen of any length, which compose it [*Navigations*] can seldom be called literature: that is, self-sufficient writings possessed of substance, of

> adequate form, and of personality. (Parks 103)

For a text to be considered a great prose epic, Parks maintains that it must demonstrate consistent strength in the individual narratives. They need to be self-sufficient, have substance, appropriate length, form, and style. Parks' insistence on appropriate form has him reject anything other than traditional, coherent narrative. Logbook entries, the many fragmented narratives, and the poems are all formally inappropriate for a proper prose epic. Hakluyt's suggestion that he leaves the narratives untouched also leads to far too many poorly written narratives, according to Parks, to the point where "the glamour of the 'prose epic' completely disappears" (Parks 124).

Today this qualitative assessment of literature or art seems quaintly outdated. Certainly the emergence of feminist studies – among many other areas of study – has made significant challenges to the literary canon. Interesting for my purposes is the fact that Parks is interested in reading the text not as a historical text, or one with significant political goals, but as a literary one. And although literary merit only occasionally arises according to Parks, there are nevertheless narratives that he deems sufficiently literary. Although the vestige of good literature is not enough to make *Navigations* a great prose epic, there is still something there that catches his eye, however briefly or sporadically.

More recent work on Hakluyt has taken a different tack, leaving the questions of so-called literariness to the past. In "Writing up the Log: The Legacy of Hakluyt," T.J. Cribb skips over Parks' criticism of Froude, locating what he calls old and new readings of Hakluyt in Froude's "England's Forgotten Worthies" and Mary C. Fuller's *Voyages in Print: English Travel to America 1574-1624* respectively. Cribb suggests that Froude broadens the scope of epic to include different striations of social standing in England: "what the old epics were to the royally or nobly born, this modern epic [was] to the common people" (Cribb 101). This conveniently excuses the different levels of quality in *Navigations*, something that Parks finds problematic. Parks suggests that Froude understands the narratives in *Navigations* as objective and organic, narratives that record a common English truth. Where Froude reads *Navigations* as the authentic voice of the common man, Fuller is concerned with textual mediation, and argues that the book demonstrates how "the failure of voyages and colonies was recuperated by rhetoric, a rhetoric which in some ways even predicted failure" (Fuller 12). Cribb reads Fuller's account of Gilbert's failed voyage suggesting that Fuller turns discreet events into psychological generalities: "Because this particular endeavour failed and the account recuperates it as martyrdom, Fuller takes this to licence a general psychologisation of history" (Cribb 101). In Cribb's analysis of Fuller, Hakluyt participates in a culture of recuperation, where English failures become martyrs through rhetorical skill. In each analysis a case can be made for *Navigations* as a national prose epic. While it would seem that Fuller is troubled by Froude's easy assessment of narrative veracity, both she (according to Cribb) and Froude show how *Navigations* serves some national function. Fuller argues that the heroic in the text is recuperated through rhetoric. In the absence of success stories, the English needed to find a way to turn failure into success. What are for Froude tragic heroes are for Fuller recuperated failures. Fuller qualifies her nationalist critique, suggesting that in the narratives of Sir Humphrey Gilbert, "a corporate and national endeavour is converted into a spiritual and intensely personal one" (Fuller 42). It is not impossible to see how personal narratives of English explorers could be used to nationalistic ends, but Fuller emphasizes the development of individual heroic martyrs in *Navigations*.

For Fuller, constructing a personalized narrative of explorers like Sir Walter Ralegh and Humphrey Gilbert – presenting so called first-hand accounts rather than collating multiple texts into impersonal narratives – creates a connection with the reader which in turn makes these explorers martyrs, valiantly in pursuit of heroic, but personal goals. Cribb argues with Fuller, suggesting that her definition of martyr is too narrow, that "the martyr bears witness to something larger than himself" (Cribb 101), undermining the assessment that the individual narratives are simply personalized, individual accounts. This does not, of course, dismiss the claim that the voyagers actually acted as martyrs; it simply broadens the term to take into account the effect of their martyrdom. Cribb's assessment of the two readings of *Navigations* demonstrates an element of the changing concerns of the academy. The aesthetic component to Fuller's reading, if it can be called that, is not focussed on an aesthetic goal. She does not discuss the quality of symbol or image, or the way these devices relate to the text as a whole. While there is no direct political assessment of *Navigations*, it is hard to think of a martyr not fulfilling some sort of political agenda. The mechanisms of power that are exerted in the construction seem to inherently look towards national and political goals. In Froude and Parks there is no notion of the political. Froude reads *Navigations* as a document of English manifest destiny, attributing to it a mythical-like status of prophesy and evidence of English greatness. Parks is less convinced by both the value of the goal or the aesthetic value of the document, and evaluates *Navigations* against the aesthetic principles of good or bad writing. While Froude's and Parks' notion of literariness may not line up with Fuller's concept of rhetorical skill, and the effect each ascribes to *Navigations* is quite different, they are all interested in how and how well the text represents certain events.

Cribb does point out a peculiar point of convergence between the two critics, suggesting that they both view Hakluyt's editorial project similarly. He suggests that Fuller understands Hakluyt's history as "something like a recomposed memory, precisely, the memory of a national history; Hakluyt's role in assembling the body [of texts] is limited merely to editorial articulation" (Cribb 102 summarising Fuller 152). For Cribb, this recomposed memory dovetails with Froude's idea that Hakluyt was a "transparent vessel for the spirit of his age" (Cribb 102). Cribb rejects the individualist emphasis Fuller ascribes to *Navigations*, preferring to understand the texts as participating in a larger social context. For Cribb, if a nationalist memory is the same as the transparent vessel, memory becomes social rather than personal and nationalism becomes an organic ethos of the age rather than a social agenda. Apart from unproblematically fusing memory to history, in this mode of historical analysis Hakluyt is not a producer of propaganda or anything else but a product of his age, faithfully reproducing texts in league with a collective social and national ethos. *Navigations* stands in for national identity, but nationalism produces *Navigations* rather than *Navigations* producing nationalism.

Strangely understated in the above argument is Hakluyt's position as propagandist. In the seminal text of late twentieth century Hakluyt study, *The Hakluyt Handbook*, rarely does an essay pass without some reference to Hakluyt as propagandist (Morgan and Coote, Simmons, and Lestrigant). Cast within the above dispute, the idea of Hakluyt as propagandist of overseas development creates a third discursive category for *Navigations*. The resolution of this tripartite structure is to reject any essential element therein, suggesting rather that *Navigations* is at once national and personal, public and propagandistic. Certainly there is an element of interest in expansion within *Navigations*, as in various introductions Hakluyt often urges voyagers to look for fertile ground and markets in the new world (see Hakluyt 1598, 432 and chapter 1, 35-36). It is also difficult to think of the narratives as private considering the amount of information Hakluyt gives about their construction. It is possible to read *Navigations* as a tool of overseas, imperial expansion. The narratives of Ralegh's and Gilbert's voyages and others can easily be read as nationalistic as well as or instead of personal, something Hakluyt gestures towards in his introduction (Hakluyt 1598, *4r). The dramatic failures of Gilbert and others could be a testament to English tenacity and bravery, a selfless pursuit of imperial rather than personal goals. Thus, Gilbert gives his life in pursuit of a northwest passage, a discovery that would have implications far beyond his own personal gain. Even the more pedestrian work of someone like Anthony Jenkinson facilitates an ongoing trade relationship with England and the Far East (For an in depth case study of Anthony Jenkinson see Chapter 3 below). Cribb's fusion of what he calls the old and new ways of reading Hakluyt suggests that the search for meaning is a red herring, and the most interesting element of future Hakluyt scholarship should be focussed on understanding Hakluyt's editorial methods.

While editorial methods are an important element of Hakluyt scholarship, the above argument often suggests that the too full picture of the new world is reduced to old-world systems of understanding and description. Similar to Dathorn's analysis discussed in chapter one, Brigitte Fleischmann, in "Uneasy Affinity" recognizes something missing in the early modern picture of new-world realities. She suggests that explorers had difficulty describing the new world because of a disjunction between the system of signification and the object of representation: "The great bulk of conquest and colonial documents testifies to the fact that the chroniclers constantly resorted to the use of comparisons relating the observed to the world they were familiar with, whether mythical, past, present, near or at spatial distance" (Fleischmann 120). Fleischmann's assessment does not sympathise with the dilemma of early modern explorers, and the use of the term 'resort' betrays her feeling that the explorers are using a second-rate means of description. Her argument focuses on the way comparison is inherently misrepresentative. In the absence of an appropriate discursive form or taxonomic structure in which to place the object of experience, the early modern explorer reduced the 'strange' to the familiar through comparative description. For Fleischmann this is a process of linguistic colonization – similar to what Mary Bain Campbell calls 'taking possession' (Campbell 31) – that reduces new-world realities to old-world myth and locates new world culture and phenomenon in an old world past.

Fleischmann's project and strategy for reading *Navigations* isolates specific texts to discover moments of authorial or ideological bias. While she asserts that comparison is fundamentally misrepresentational, she pushes her analysis further, examining the ideological framework that prefigures the narratives of the early modern explorer. Taking up two specific figures from *Navigations*, Fleischmann compares how the difference in the directions that prefigure a narrative potentially shift the focus and readability of the text produced. She compares Hakluyt's instructions to Thomas Hariot with the instructions found in Humphrey Gilbert's patent for an exploratory voyage to America:

> The Roanoke report was different from the general body of travel narratives in tone and content, even though the original instructions for the Virginia expedition had been formulated in terms which betray that English expectations had been shaped by the lore of strangeness. Thus in Sir Gilbert's [sic] patent we find the exhortation to the adventurers 'to search out remote heathens and barbarous lands.' (Fleischmann 121)

This contrasts with Thomas Hariot's instructions included in *Navigations* – which he follows to produce *A Briefe and True Report* – directions which Fleischmnann suggests produced a narrative that "must have been disappointing to the average reader because it followed the guidelines of Hakluyt's policy that soberly asked to describe creatures and things that could be expected to be useful or strategically relevant" (Fleischmann 120). There certainly are some propagandistic interests in Peckham that contribute to his over dramatization of certain events, and Gilbert's voyages have their fair share of drama. Because Gilbert is mandated to search for 'barbarous and heathen lands,' the narratives that come back from his voyages read like adventure stories, filled with harrowing experiences with strange creatures and the elements. Indeed, Hayes' account of Gilbert's voyage in 1583 tells of one ship running aground and breaking up, and of Gilbert himself "deuoured and swallowed vp of the Sea" after exhorting "We are as neere to heauen by sea as by land," (Hakluyt 1600, 159). His heroism could be tarnished somewhat, since it is his rashness and refusal to lisen to his pilot that has the ship run aground. By contrast, Harriot's sober and careful list of commodities for extraction reads like a shopping list.

Fleischmann stops short of qualitative judgements but suggests reasonably that the content of each narrative is dictated by a separate subjective mandate. Her analysis points out the ideological spectre of each narrative that governs both rhetorical strength and phenomenological accuracy. One should be careful to note that Fleischmann is not exposing some hidden, repressed content here. The narratives, letters patent, and exploratory directives are included in *Navigations*. But, by advancing the theory that each narrative is constructed by certain principles of narration and exploration, Fleischmann attributes a type of flaw to each, suggesting ultimately that they are all provisional, but some are less exciting than others. In psychoanalytic parlance, the understanding of a particular flaw within systems or the self has been analyzed through hysteria or neurosis. For Lacan, mental health is the illusion of wholeness that can never be attained, but misrecognition, like the provisional flaws that Fleischmann sees working in *Navigations* is not a flaw, it "represents a certain organization of affirmations and negations, to which the subject is attached" (Lacan, *Freud's Papers*, 167). While Fleischmann is not the hysterical subject in this instance, the question she addresses to the narrative other can be construed as a hysterical question. The question Fleischmann asks the other is "why do these narratives depict the new world the way they do? Why is Gilbert's narrative interesting and Hariot's not?" The answer for Fleischmann is twofold: in each narrative, social and phenomenological reality is reduced to a specific play of old-world signifiers that are inherently ineffective in capturing a new-world reality, and these narratives do not escape ideological influence. Fleischmann is less interested in endorsing or condemning Gilbert or Hariot than she is in illustrating the fundamental problems with the discursive framework, how the respective mandates of Gilbert and Hariot affect representation.

There are some textual discrepancies between Hariot's *True Report* and the version Hakluyt includes in *Navigations*. Hariot's 1590 publication has an introduction from Theodore de Bry, where *Navigations* has an introduction that comes from Ralph Lane, "one of her Maiesties Esquiers, and Gouernour of the Colony in *Virginia*" (Hakluyt 1600, 266). Lane undermines his own authority, suggesting that he is not an expert in cosmographical affairs:

> ALbeit (gentle Reader) the credit of the reports in this Treatise contained can little be furthered by the testimony of one as my selfe, through affection iudged partiall, though without desert: neuerthelesse, for somuch as I haue bene requested by some my particular friends, who conceiue more rightly of me, to deliuer freely my knowledge of the same, not onely for the satisfying of them, but also for the true information of any other whosoeuer, that comes not with a priudicate winde to the reading thereof: thus much vpon my credit I am to affirme, that things vniuersally are so truely se downe is this Treatise by the authour thereof, an actor in the Colony, and a man no lesse for his honesty then learning commendable, as that I dare boldly auouch, it may very well passe with the credit of trueth euen amongst the most true relatios of this age. Which as for mine owne part I am ready any way with my word to acknowledge, so also (of the certaintie thereof assured by mine owne experience) with this my publique assertion I doe affirme the same. Farewell in the Lord. (Hakluyt 1600, 266)

It is unclear who these anonymous friends are, but it is most likely that Hakluyt encouraged Lane to contribute to *Navigations*. Lane is included because of his personal experience in Virginia.

I will show in more detail below how marginal notes qualify the main text, but here is an additional text that does the same thing. In *Navigations* at least, it is a rare occurrence that a narrative includes its own supporting document, but perhaps Hakluyt sought out Lane because Hariot includes a similar endorsement from Theodore de Bry in his own text. De Bry's participation is not limited to text, of course, as he contributes several of his famous copper plate engravings. These images show up in numerous early modern texts, but de Bry suggests – in rather idiosyncratic English – that Hariot's text is a particularly good one:

> I haue thincke that I cold faynde noe better occasion to declare yt, then takinge the paines to cott in copper (the most diligent ye and well that wear my possible to doe) the Figures which doe leuelye represent the forme aud maner of the Inhabitants of thesame countrye with theirs ceremonies, sollemne, feastes, and the manner and situation of their Townes, or Villages. (Harriot 4)

The use of de Bry's images marks a significant difference between *Navigations* and Hariot's *True Report*. In spite of the fact that Hakluyt instructs certain voyagers to draw an approximation of the land (see above 60), there are no images or pictures in *Navigations* at all. It is clear that Hakluyt makes a choice to remove any pictures from any text he collects. Where Hariot endorses his text through visual representation, Hakluyt sticks to textual endorsement.

This is one of the few consistencies that are present in the text. Hakluyt is clearly making a textual comment, a peculiar limitation for one who is interested in including all manner of texts in terms of form and style. While the absence of any pictorial element does set Hakluyt apart from a few of the writers whose texts he includes, more significant to the present study is the way he positions the texts themselves. There is no suggestion to truth claims in any text. In fact, Hakluyt overtly resists this and calls into question the stability of all texts. Hakluyt underscores this position by repeatedly presenting different perspectives, strange forms of historical narrative, and contrary opinions and critical assessments.

Hakluyt as English Desire

An investigation into Hakluyt's possible motivation for *Navigations* shows the complexity of the project and its multiple functions, some of which endorse the critical perspectives outlined above. Hakluyt's interest in travel and exploration was certainly motivated by the possibility of discovering trade routes and his interest in the new world certainly included colonization. That Hakluyt includes instructions that detail the problems of representation and some provisional solutions provocatively underscores an anxiety about representation. In achieving his own goal, Hakluyt must necessarily incorporate other interests as well. The result is a text that can be said to possess certain post-structural narrative elements. I have already suggested that the individual narratives from *Navigations* are produced from multiple sources, but the collage-like picture that *Navigations* produces is not limited to narrative sources. Froude's assertion that *Navigations* is a prose epic has been questioned on literary grounds, but *Navigations* is still highly literary. The diversity of genre and form in *Navigations* pushes the idea of polyvocality further. The practices of collection in *Navigations* demonstrate multiple voices and lay bare the problematical method of historical construction. Looking for a hard distinction between fiction and history becomes problematical when reading *Navigations* in its entirety, in part because of the multiple and varied agendas and desires for closure within the text.

It is clear from Hakluyt's introductory remarks that his motivation for compiling

Navigations comes from strong patriotism as well as his interest in cartography and exploration narrative. *Navigations* satisfies both his nationalistic and intellectual urges. In the 'Epistle Dedicatorie' to the first edition, Hakluyt details his early experience and fascination with cartography and narratives of discovery. Visiting his cousin studying at Westminster, he is shown the "division of the earth into three parts after the olde account, and then according to the latter, & better distribution, into more: he pointed his wand to all the known seas" (Hakluyt 1589, *2r). With his taste for geography and exploration so whetted, Hakluyt expresses his desire to "be ministered in these studies" (Hakluyt 1589, *2r).

While Hakluyt may have been interested in the scholarly life and most of what such a life implies, he was certainly not an ivory tower academic, distanced from a sense of social and national duty. Hakluyt felt strongly that his work was performing some social function, that it was attached to national interests, and that truthfully representing the successes and failures of English exploration carried a moral as well as a practical imperative. On some level, Hakluyt sees *Navigations* as a kind of pedagogical tool: presenting English naval failures will inspire future explorers, and those in power, to find ways of "banishing . . . our former grosse ignorance in Marine causes, and for the increase and generall multiplying of the sea-knowledge in this age" (Hakluyt 1598, *3r). Pointing out both failures and successes of English exploration would help to construct accurate expectation and describe natural environments and dangers. This knowledge would be invaluable to subsequent voyagers, allowing them to anticipate, and prepare for, encounters with the natural and social world. *Navigations* does this exhaustively, presenting narratives about cultures, clashes, resolutions, and natural catastrophes. In many respects, *Navigations* is a book about potential rather than actual achievement, interested in strategies to make sea travel and exploration much safer.

As for the motivational power of his writing, Hakluyt sees a great, untapped potential in English exploration and he is somewhat distressed at what he describes as a surprising absence of accurate writing on the subject:

> Howbeit, seeing no man to step forth to vndertake the recording of so many memorable actions, but euery man to folow his priuate affaires: the ardent loue of my countrey deuoured all difficulties, and as it were with a sharpe goad prouoked me and thrust me forward into this most troublesome and painfull action. (Hakluyt 1598, *2r)

Earlier in the dedicatory epistle, Hakluyt states his affinity for cartography and the history of discovery, but the impetus to publish *Navigations* comes from what he sees as the combined apathy of his fellow Englishmen and the significance of English discovery. His interest in study is clear, but the immense task of compiling the history of English travel also comes from a profound sense of national responsibility. In the front matter to all of the editions of *Navigations* Hakluyt discusses the arduous work of compiling the text, casting his work as collector and editor in the same epic tone used to describe the collection itself. The work is brought forth "after great charges and infinite cares, after many watchings, toiles, and trauels, and wearying out of [his] weake body" (Hakluyt 1598, *2r).

While some have suggested that this comparison is a specious one, there is a direct correlation between the desire Hakluyt has for discovery, and the desire that he sees in the English nation. In the "Epistle Dedicatorie" for the first volume of the second edition of *Navigations* Hakluyt makes a fundamental claim about the state of the nation, saying that "God hath raised so generall a desire in the youth of this realme to discover all parts of the face of the earth, to this realm in former ages not knowen" (Hakluyt 1598, *3r). Hakluyt's assertion of his nation's youths' urge to discover comes on the heels of a request of Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, for more educated "Sea-men and Mariners in this Realme" (Hakluyt 1598, *3r). Hakluyt's inclusion of Howard's request presents *Navigations* as the space for the enunciation of desire and its fulfilment. But Hakluyt's didacticism regarding proper training for sailors can also be read as participation in colonial expansion in North America, similar to the colonial aims Richard Eden outlines in his preface to *The Decades of the New World*. But there are significant differences in Hakluyt's and Eden's impulses. In the introduction to *Decades*, Eden sets up a clear hierarchy between the natives and Europeans, claiming that the natives are closer to animals than humans, urging the English to emulate Spanish violent treatment of the indigenous people and imitate what he calls "theyr [the Spanish] mercyfull warres ageynst these naked people" (Eden 1555, Aiv v = Arber 50). Eden casts violence as a kind of mercy, using indigenous barbarity as a justification for violence.

Eden invokes biblical prophesy of sorts, one that shows his interest in the use of violence over negotiation, and chides the English unwillingness to approach the indigenous people of the new world in an appropriate manner:

> this deuelysshe generation is so consumed, partely by the slaughter of suche as coulde by no meanes be brought to ciuilitie, and partly by reseruynge such as were ouecome in the warres, and conuertynge them to a better mynde, that the prophecie may herein bee fulfylled that the woolfe and the lambe shall feede together, and the wylde fieldes with the vale of Ahor, shalbe the folde of the heard of gods people (Eden 1555, Aiv v = Arber 50)

Eden invokes a biblical imperative in his introduction to subdue both the land and the people of the new world. Hakluyt's interest in the new world, as mentioned in chapter one, differs from Eden's in his emphasis on developing trade, rather than conducting wars against the inhabitants of the new world. Hakluyt asserts that the desire to explore and discover was alive and quite well in England. What needed improvement was the way in which it was undertaken. His appeal is at once urgent and measured, expressing confidence in the continuation of English exploration and an interest in improving its safety and success, making the distinction between passionate advocate and propagandist less clear.

It is clear that Hakluyt was interested in cataloguing English voyages primarily for the benefit of the English people, and often criticism of his work focusses on this exclusive approach as a kind of bigotry. Joan-Pau Rubiés defines Hakluyt's nationalism this way:

> Hakluyt's main originality consisted in encouraging nationalist feelings by concentrating on Englishmen as central figures in navigations and discoveries. Thus, even though Hakluyt's work was often inspired by Ramusio's example, he abandoned the Venetian's universalist emphasis. His appeal to national pride obviously had a strong manipulative power, which could be used to lead people from fear of the Spanish threat to excitement with Drake's practical achievements. The information provided by the reports was intended to dispel incredulity, to stir interest and to stimulate action. (159)

The fear of the Spanish threat fits much more aptly for the first edition of *Navigations* than the second. In 1589, the memory of the Spanish attack, though disastrous for the Armada, would still be fresh in the minds of many. By 1600, however, England's naval fortunes had changed dramatically. David Loades writes in *England's Maritime Empire*, that "by 1600 English galleons were as good as those built anywhere in Europe; English cartography and navigational skills were matched only by the Dutch, and English sea gunnery was the best in the world" (Loades 131). For Rubiés, Hakluyt's most significant contribution is also his most significant flaw, constructing a text to manipulate the English population into pride for their country at the expense of other nations. Clearly on some level, Hakluyt's interest in English narratives comes from what he sees as an absence in the historical record, a story that has been left out of the grand narrative of exploration, and his goal is as much about matching English ability to desire as it is in creating interest in exploration.

In spite of the gains made in England's naval capacity, at the time of *Navigations'* publication, the English lagged behind the Spanish, French, and Portuguese in overseas expansion and development, and with the disaster of the Roanoke Island settlement a testimony to English incompetence, the nation's desires for colonial expansion were in need of some cheerleading. Sir Walter Ralegh attempted twice to settle Roanoke Island. In the first instance, Richard Grenville's voyage of 1585, those intended to settle the new world did not last a year, and were eventually rescued by Francis Drake (Hakluyt 1600, 251-60). A second colonization attempt undertaken in 1587 included women and children, all of whom mysteriously disappeared (Hakluyt 1600, 280-287). *Navigations* includes a support voyage of John White a year later where remnants of the settlment are found. Hakluyt puts a brave face on English travel, going so far as to suggest that the discoveries of the English nation were in fact quite impressive, indeed more so than the more glamorous discoveries made by other nations:

> Be it granted that the renowmed *Portugale Vasquez de Gama* trauersed the maine Ocean Southward of *Africke:* Did not *Richard Chanceler* and his mates performe the like Northward of *Europe?* Suppose that *Columbus* that noble and high-spirited *Genuois* escried vnknowen landes to the Westward of *Europe* and *Africke:* Did not the valiant *English* knight sir *Hugh Willoughby;* did not the famous Pilots *Stephen Burrough, Arthur Pet,* and *Charles Iackman* accoast *Noua Zembla, Colgoieue,* and *Vaigatz*

> to the North of *Europe* and *Asia?* Howbeit you will say perhaps, not with the like golden successe, not with such deductions of Colonies, nor attaining of conquests. True it is, that our successe hath not bene correspondent vnto theirs: yet in this our attempt the vncertaintie of finding was farre greater, and the difficultie and danger of searching was no whit lesse. (Hakluyt 1598, *4r)

Whether his assessment is accurate or not, Hakluyt's suggestion that 'uncertaintie' in exploration was far greater for the English than for either the Spanish or Portuguese emphasizes a specific valuation of the quality of travel and the pursuit of knowledge undertaken by the British. For Hakluyt there is a valuable element of the voyage that escapes simple commodification or obvious success, something important in English travel not bound up in the greedy exploitation of foreign successes. This assertion is a bit far fetched, since Francis Drake, Martin Frobisher, John Hawkins and others were given free rein from Queen Elizabeth to privateer and poach the fruits of Spanish and Portuguese 'greed' for the betterment of themselves and the English nation. Nevertheless, Hakluyt often chalks up navigational failure, foreign or English, to explorers displacing interest in knowledge with greed. The open secret of England's piracy is contained in *Navigations* in the near mythical dimensions of Drake's privateering exploits (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 121-123). *Navigations* includes information about Drake from Spanish texts – a Libel from Don Bernaldino delgadillo de Auellaneda (Hakluyt 1600, 577-593) – and from Drake himself. In spite of this, Hakluyt suggests that probing uncertainty has its own valuable quality, and that the English attempt things far greater than other countries. While they may not have had the ringing successes of the Spanish and Portuguese, the English big failures are the consequence of thinking, and acting, big.

Part of what made things easier for the Spanish and Portuguese, according to Hakluyt, was the existence of friendly ports of call and literary guidance. The Spanish had the Canary Islands and the Portuguese the "*Açores,* of *Porto santo,* of *Madera,* of *Cape ved,* the castle of *Mina,* the fruitfull and profitable Isle of S. *Thomas,*" (Hakluyt 1598, *5r). And where the English sailed to Russia and the North Sea without any literary guidance, Hakluyt points to a plethora of textual sources for the Spanish and Portuguese that aided in their discoveries. Hakluyt finds many literary narratives that he claims predict the Americas, mostly from Greek sources, that at times seem to be a bit of a stretch. He goes so far as to suggest that Plato, when referring to Atlantis, is plainly describing the Americas (Hakluyt 1598, *5v). The English were the only nation to forge their discoveries out of complete uncertainty, which is one, but not the only, reason for their limited success. As with many of Hakluyt's absolute claims, his assertion of the complete absence of literary precedent to English exploration is inaccurate. Hakluyt includes a text from Sigismund Herberstein that describes a voyage to Russia. While there are no sounding measurements or precise geographical information in the text, it does reference place names and estimated travel times between specific places. The rather prominent reference to the rivers Dwina and Ob prefigures the observations of Jenkinson years later. Hakluyt does not give any specific date for the narrative, but there is a section dated 1518, that describes meeting rather simple Russian folk who are easily converted to Christianity. While the political and cartographical value of this text is limited, its inclusion in *Navigations* certainly problematizes Hakluyt's claim that English travel proceeded with no textual help.

The reason Hakluyt foregrounds English failures is as much a ploy to encourage a system of nautical education as it is about historical accuracy. In spite of the gains made by Frobisher, Jenkinson, and others, the crown dedicated little money to exploratory or colonial pursuits. Elizabeth had a passing interest in overseas expansion, but the real fuel to the fire came from the privateering exploits of Francis Drake, and the myth of his success at times exaggerates his prowess. Drake's 1577 voyage left England with four ships and 180 men and returned three years later with only one ship and about half the men (Loades 115-116). Although his voyage contributed virtually nothing to England's geographical, cartographical, or ethnographical knowledge, David Loades suggests that this is the moment where England signalled not only that they were willing to engage in overseas expansion, but they also possessed the skills and technology to do so (Loades 116). Drake's influential voyage does not clear an easy path for future voyages, however, and significant failures from Gilbert and Frobisher still wait in England's future. Hakluyt understands the problem of English maritime failure and attempts to accommodate it by suggesting that it was not simply that the English took on too great a challenge to succeed – it is not that great achievement lay outside the grasp of the English – but rather that ultimate success relied on support and education from many parts of English society. To Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, Hakluyt carefully presses his suit for greater education:

> I trust it shall not be impertinent in passing by, to point at the meanes of breeding vp of skilfull Sea-men and Mariners in this Realme. Sithence your Lordship is not ignorant, that ships are to litle purpose without skilfull Sea-men; and since Sea-men are not bred vp to perfection of skill in much lesse time (as it is said) then in the time of two prentiships; and since no kinde of men of any profession in the common wealth passe their yeres in so great and continuall hazard of life; and since of so many, so few grow to gray heires: how needfull it is, that by way of Lectures and such like instructions, these ought to haue a better education, then hitherto they haue had (Hakluyt 1598,*3r)

Here Hakluyt is concerned with both the mariners and the state of the nation. He concedes that there is no more dangerous work than that of a sailor, and that it is folly to have great technology – a technology that was expanding with developments in English shipbuilding and gunnery – without appropriately skilled people to operate it. He also recognizes that sea exploration is an inherently dangerous occupation, and that the experience of veteran explorers should be exploited as a means of training new explorers. Here Hakluyt practices what he preaches: the narratives included in *Navigations* are pedagogical tools for future voyages as much as an argument for better training of England's ever-growing naval fleet. Training and education can only increase the success of English exploration. Hakluyt is making an intervention regarding English policy, suggesting that in the absence of friendly ports of call, literature and lectures are the most efficient way to educate the nation's future seamen, an intervention that he is, at least in part, curiously able to fulfill.

T.J. Cribb suggests that the point of Hakluyt's book, and more importantly the reason Hakluyt adopts the editorial method he does, is "so that the reader may *use* the information for practical purposes" (Cribb 102). There are concrete examples within *Navigations* to support Cribb's suggestion that it is a work designed for this sort of use. There are numerous narratives in *Navigations* that are dedicated to travel protocol and safe sailing. There is also a wealth of information in the book designed to advise future exploration or development. Cribb, however, pushes his analysis further, finding Hakluyt's historical precision as a guide to more literary productions.[6]

There are also moments where the phenomenological argument seen between Nicols and Thevet in chapter one has found its way into more contemporary scholarly practices. Nicols' material demand is a critical practice that has spawned imitation. Within the textual reception of *Navigations*, there are many examples of phenomenological thrust and parry like that between Nicols and Thevet. Reginald Auger, in "Decentring Icons of History: Exploring the Archaeology of the Frobisher Voyages and Early European-Inuit contact," recreates Martin Frobisher's voyages in search of a northwest passage to discover the physical points of contact. The conclusions triumphantly locate the part of Baffin Island where Frobisher thought he found gold. The counterpoints to this sort of analysis are the many studies that debunk the claims of various voyagers. There are also many studies that investigate where John Cabot went, and what landmasses he discovers (Pope 24-36). The focus of each critical move is to find internally consistent narratives, and in Auger's instance, consistency that follows what he presumes to be externally consistent physical reality. Reaching a conclusion on the basis of content of individual narratives elides the bigger picture of *Navigations*, which grapples with the double trauma of experience and representation. That is, the fact that the analyses of these critics are right, that they are able to prove or disprove the accuracy of early modern voyages, is precisely not the point. The question that needs to be asked is how is it possible for each of these writers, critics, and voyagers to be correct, and what are the consequences of such an appraisal?

---

[6] See Davis' logbook (Hakluyt 1600, 115-118). The early voyages of Frobisher (Hakluyt 1600, 4-35) are also good examples of nautical precision.

At the very least, it is clear that *Navigations* has been put to multiple uses. Critical assessment has suggested that Hakluyt's work created a desire for overseas expansion and was a passive conduit of a historical ethos; he has been an educator of seamen and an inspiration for literature; he was a force for social action and a product of his times; he helped create English martyrs and gave the common man a voice; he was the architect of the national prose epic and a collector of personal stories and myth. If the diversity of *Navigations* is not adequately represented in any single critical perspective, it is registered in the breadth of critical perspective.

Is History Art?

In 'The Preface to the Second Edition,' Hakluyt's introduction thematically outlines the structure of the book. The loose parameters of form and structure of the individual travel narratives – the very fact that instructions for how to write a travel narrative accompanied the voyagers suggests there was no standard form – is mirrored in much of early modern writing. As with the state of history and historical writing, many forms of writing were in a state of ferment. Not only were genre and forms shifting, but many of the textual practices now standard were in nascent stages of development. Indexes and tables of contents were organized in a variety of ways, if texts included them at all (Rouse and Rouse 115-141 and Orgel 286-288). Even ordering an index alphabetically was not yet a standard practice (Cormak and Mazzio 65-67). Hakluyt orders his text geographically. With the English voyages, he begins with northeast exploration, then southeast, and finally northwest and new world exploration. He appends the Spanish and Portuguese voyages to the English collection – although there are some non-English texts scattered throughout – which mostly describe exploration of Central and South America. From the cross section of foreign texts that Hakluyt includes in *Navigations*, the Spanish and Portuguese seem far more organized than the English. Much of the reason for this was strong top down interest in exploration from monarchs like Philip of Spain. Unlike the English, for the Spanish "ship's logs and itineraries were obligatory" (Parks 97). As a result, Spanish writers had solid source documents to work from. Often English narratives were cobbled together from multiple sources. Most voyages would have maintained some sort of account of the voyage, and while most are now lost, it is clear that logbooks were consulted in the construction of a formal narrative. But just as there is a wide variance in the ways in which formal travel texts are constructed, there are many different forms of narrative included in *Navigations* that attempt to tell some sort of story of the voyage. *Navigations* includes a wide variety of forms, from a standard narrative structure, to poetry, and dialogue, and on one occasion includes the actual log book from a voyage. Little has been said about the formal engagements of *Navigations*, an aspect of the text that has implications for how text represents an event, and how the writers and compilers of those texts understood the

(

impact of form and content.

The overwhelming majority of the travel texts in *Navigations* are what I will call 'standard' texts. There are some formal changes from narrative to narrative, but most accounts follow a linear progression, the narrator describing pertinent events as the voyage progresses. These texts often contain lists of commodities, and of various flora and fauna found, and sometimes lists of foreign words and a key for translation.[7] The narrative flows as a coherent whole, with observations and discoveries of interest sutured into the narrative. In these narratives down-time is absent, subsumed within the narrative structure. The dates and location are often recorded within the main text, but usually cited only when something of importance is encountered. There are moments where the narrator, at some point in the narrative, suggests that for the sake of brevity, or to stave off boredom, certain elements of the voyage have been omitted. Cæsar Frederike's narrative, for instance, is cut short because of his interest in avoiding mention of atrocities against Jews (Hakluyt 1598, 126). In his rather unflattering portrayal of Russia, George Turbervile suggests decorum and proper manners prevent him from retelling all of the atrocious behaviour he witnesses (Hakluyt 1598, 387-388). Variation between individual texts is limited generally to narrative ability, varying amounts of preparedness (for example pre-voyage instructions as discussed earlier), and attention to detail. In chapter three I will discuss in more detail individual narratives included in *Navigations*.

There are a number of texts within *Navigtions* that are oral interviews (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 102-110). Cribb suggests that when re-presenting accounts from these interviews, Hakluyt set a trend with his dressed-down style, something that was not in vogue before, but became so afterward (Cribb, 103). He also suggests that Hakluyt valued the reports of common sailors (105). Cribb may be hinting at Greenblatt's notion of mime – where history writers write in a style from the lower classes (Greenblatt, *Negotiations* 134) – but if Hakluyt's practices of taking dictation are the same as his practices of transcription, his writing could simply be attempting to imitate the speech of his interviewee. There can be no question that something changes in the translation from oral speech to written record, but study of the potential shift is near impossible and certainly beyond the scope of this project. Most of the texts leave something to be desired stylistically, but there are some that have no style at all. In John Davis' voyage in search of a North West Passage in 1587, Hakluyt includes the logbook from the voyage (Hakluyt 1600, 115-118). This "Traverse-Booke" is simply a chart, its emphasis on hard data rather than rhetoric. The various columns separate the date, time, course of the ship, leagues traveled, latitude and longitude, direction of the wind, and what he calls "The Discourse." For most of the categories, entries are made daily, and some categories, like wind direction, course, and distance traveled, have several entries daily. Entries for the discourse portion of the log are made sporadically, sometimes presenting interesting facts or events, and other times stating simply "The true course, & c." (Hakluyt 1600, 117). These entries appear to refer to the direction noted in the other columns, literally endorsing the empirical, hard data. The attention to the distance traveled and longitude and latitude is certainly included to aid future voyages. The slow progress of the text and empirical data demonstrates that the voyage is for the most part exceedingly boring, but the traverse book style presents another verisimilar facet to travel narrative. Not only does the discourse element of the text employ a dressed-down style, as Cribb suggests Hakluyt favored, but the very form of the text emphasizes the plodding moments of a voyage.

---

[7] Martin Frobisher's 1576 northwest voyage to discover a passage to China, for instance, contains a short list of words of the people of Meta incognita, translated into English (Hakluyt 1600, 32).

In spite of the dull presentation, there are exciting events that take place in Davis' voyage. He describes encounters with hostile natives, icebergs, and near-fatal storms in a plain and unemotional style. The entry for July 6–8 relays the dangers of moving through the north in July when the ice is breaking up. The narrative describes several moments where the crew pick their way through dangerous ice floes:[8]

> The true course, &c. This 6 of Iuly we put our barke thorow the ice, seeing the sea free on the West side: and hauing sailed 5 leagues West, we fell with another mighty barre, which we could not passe: and therefore returning againe, we freed our selues the 8 of this moneth at midnight, and so recouered the sea through Gods fauour, by faire winds, the weather being very calme. (Hakluyt 1600, 118)

This language certainly does not express the anxiety of what surely would have been a nail-biting experience. There is also little to be said about rhetorical recuperation here. It seems much more accurate to suggest that the rhetorical strength of this passage lies in its straightforward presentation and unaffected style. Rubiés has suggested that narrative collections like *Navigations* were struggling for narrative credibility, and this direct and experiential narrative type was a means of achieving it. There is no attempt to play on the emotions of the reader. The language of the logbook mirrors its counterpart, and the textual format brings home the dullness of the voyage. This simple, straightforward language follows with a kind of Baconian logic (Bacon, *Works* 134-40), where pared-down language presents reality more clearly, but this narrative surely misses the drama of the event. There is no fear in the discourse, no emphasis of the immediate danger, just a simple list of events. The passionless language also leaves the reader cold to the results of the voyagers themselves. This text seems unlikely to motivate nation or subject to great deeds.

---

[8] There are many examples in early modern marine travel where ships encounter natural disasters, placing a premium on nautical information. While the ice floes were a moving target, one of the earliest English travelers to the new world, one of the ships in Humphrey Gilbert's voyage to northern Canada meets its end when it is grounded on a sand bar and overcome in a storm (Hakluyt 1600, 156-58).

Davis' logbook is sandwiched between standard texts of the voyages themselves. Davis makes three voyages to the new world from 1585 to 1587. The first and third narratives are written by a merchant, Master John Janes, and it is clear that in the third voyage at least Janes relies substantially on Davis' logbook. A comparison of the logbook and the text of the third voyage shows that Janes copies substantial sections of the logbook into his text. Some stylistic changes are made, and the narrative is fleshed out a bit more, but by and large the narrative is the same. After the logbook there is an entry that collates all three of the narratives titled, "A report of Master John Davis of his three voyages made for the discovery of the North-west passage, taken out of a Treatise of his, Intituled the worlds Hydrographicall description" (Hakluyt 1600, 119). The narrative is short and sweet, describing the distances travelled, the purpose of the voyages, and significant discoveries. The presence of the logbook and the third narrative shows the scaffolding of the narrative structure, and indicates the sources of the main texts. With this in mind, a reevaluation of the textual history is further complicated. In this series of texts, Hakluyt gives us the single perspective in Davis' logbook, the only place in *Navigations* where he does so. The Davis narrative hints at the positive qualities of a single account, where the narrative that follows from Janes is superfluously tidied up for entertainment as much as accuracy.

Poetry's Fainting Pen

With many of the empirical travel accounts like those above, truth claims are often made in the title of the narrative. In the narrative of Humphrey Gilbert's 1583 voyage, Peckham claims he is making "A *true* Report of the late discoueries . . . of the *Newfound Lands*" (Hakluyt 1600, 165). Hakluyt is also interested in a truthful account of the new world, but his relationship to 'truth' is broader than eyewitness testimony. By including the "Knights prologue" from Geoffrey Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, Hakluyt suggests that fictionalized historical accounts are a part of historical narrative and can contribute to a sense of national understanding. Chaucer's text is placed between two travel narratives which are disparate in terms of their time and place: a fourteenth century voyage to Persia and a "testimonie out of the fourteenth booke of the Annales of Cornelius Tacitus, prooving London to have beene a famous mart towne in the reigne of Nero the Emperour, which died in the yeere of Christ 70 " (Hakluyt 1600, 124). The introductory comment suggests that Chaucer's text is based on historical fact and is an important English text:

> The verses of Geofrey Chaucer in the knights Prologue, who liuing in the yeere 1402. (as hee writeth himselfe in his Epistle of Cupide) shewed that the English Knights after the losse of Acon, were wont in his time to trauaile into Prussia and Lettowe, and other heathen lands, to aduance the Christian faith against Infidels and miscreants, and to seeke honour by feats of armes. (Hakluyt 1598, 124)

For Hakluyt, Chaucer's poem is an accurate account of certain historical actions undertaken by the English. Chaucer not only captures a spirit of the period, but factual elements as well.

The poetry in *Navigations* is not limited to this function, however. There is a rather lengthy section written by the poet George Turbervile, who writes "letters in verse" to "describe the maners of the Countrey and people" (Hakluyt 1598, 384) of Russia. There are three letters in all, each written to a specific person. The first letter is dedicated to the poet's "especiall friend Master Edward Dancie" (Hakluyt 1598, 384), the second to someone named "Spencer", and the third to Parker. There is some dispute about the identity of the second of the three. Hyder E. Rollins summarises the rather thin history of the letters, suggesting that "Anthony à Wood supplied the name 'Edmund,' believing that the letters were written by *The Faerie Queen* poet" (Rollins 150). Rollins does call this assertion into question suggesting that "the supposition that Turbervile wrote to a Dorsetshire friend named Spencer, just as he wrote to other local friends named Parker and Dancie, is very reasonable" (Rollins 151). Whether Turbervile is writing to the famous Spenser or not, it appears that the other two are not figures of any historical repute. Turbervile tells his friend that he was loath to leave the friendly familiarity of England for profligate Russia. The forty or so rhyming couplets are dedicated to exclaiming the utter debauchery of Russian people. He declares them godless, saying "Idoles have their hearts, on God they never call, Unlesse it be (Nichola Bough) that hangs against the wall" (Hakluyt 1598, 385). This assertion is somewhat at odds with Richard Chancellor's observations about Russian religion.[9] He claims that they are indeed Christians, but fixated on the Old Testament. He also records the Russian disdain for what they saw as half-Christian practices of the English (Hakluyt 1598, 252-255). According to Turbervile, the Russians are also lustful, especially the women, dirty, and given to excessive drinking. While this is not a wholly fanciful account – Turbervile did in fact spend time in Russia – there is little factual information. The poem is primarily a personal reflection, and his distaste for Russia and its people is palpable.

The second and third letters are much longer than the first and do not have the same familiarity. Both are dedicated to specific people. In the letter written to Spencer, Turbervile states that this poem was solicited, and that he faced reprisals if he had neglected to send back information. It is unclear whether this is a rhetorical flourish or a sincere fear, as is whether the letter is to serve in some official capacity or not. The poem, again written in couplets, is similarly interested in the people and culture of Russia but also gives significant information about certain agricultural and climatic facts. Turbervile tells of a seven-month winter and the lack of good soil for agriculture. He also discusses the animals of Russia somewhat generally, saying "their beastes be like to ours, as farre as I can see/ For shape, and shewe, but somewhat lesse of bulke, and bone they be./ Of waterish taste, the flesh not firme, like English Beefe" (Hakluyt 1598, 386). The third poem, addressed simply "To Parker" (Hakluyt 1598, 387), is both personal, describing Parker as a friend and referring several times to his friend's "assured Love," and formal, including for the first time the military characteristics of the Russian people. Turbervile discusses dress and social custom, noting that chess, a game noted for its historical connection to military strategy, is popular among the Russians. He also compares the Russians to the Irish in their savageness and the Turks in their lasciviousness.

---

[9] There are two versions of the 1553 voyage begun by Hugh Willoughby and Richard Chancellor to Cathay. One comes from Chancellor himself (Hakluyt 1598, 243) and the other is a narrative solicited by Hakluyt written by Clement Adams (Hakluyt 1598, 231).

Significant in this poem – and to a lesser extent the "Spencer" poem – however, is what Turbervile does not say and how he frames this silence. Turbervile repeatedly gets close to making some definitive statement about the Russian people, then backs away saying "Conceive the rest your selfe, and dreeme what lives they lead" (Hakluyt 1598, 388). When describing the depths of their moral depravity he suggests that "if I would describe the whole, I feare my pen would faint" (Hakluyt 1598, 389). These statements seem odd for one who ends his letter stating that Parker should "know the Russes well" after reading the poem. Turbervile's urging here makes the reader a part of the narrative, and asks the reader to construct the text him or herself. The ending of the "Spencer" poem introduces the theme of incompleteness, stating "I write not all I know, I touch but here and there,/ For if I should, my penne would pinch, and eke offend I feare. /Who shall read this verse, conjecture of the rest" (1598, 387). It is unclear who he is afraid of offending, but he suggests that the reader become an active participant in the construction of the text precisely because the text cannot tell the whole story.

The inclusion of the "Knight's Prologue" and the poems of George Turbervile presents a different picture of the function of both. "The Knight's Prologue" is a fictional, third-person account of a series of historical events. Several scholars have suggested that Chaucer's knight is in fact based on the historical figure of John Hawkwood, but they have also pointed out significant differences between Chaucer's ideal, gentle knight and the real historical figure (Jones). Whatever the historical accuracy, Hakluyt finds some validity in the fictional character who happens to tell a story with some historical veracity. Turbervile, on the other hand, is presenting poetry that is designed to present ontology. This is not the only moment where the vulgar assertion of poetry in opposition to history is challenged in the early modern period. A strong exponent of the value of poetry, Philip Sidney makes a clear distinction between the social work of poetry and that of history. In *The Defence of Poetry*, Sidney lauds the value of poetry while casting history and historians in a rather unfavourable light:

> The historian scarcely giveth leisure to the moralist to say so much, but that he loaden with old mouse-eaten records, authorizing himself (for the most part) upon other histories, whose greatest authorities are built upon the notable foundations of hearsay; having much ado to accord differing writers and to pick truth out of partiality; better acquainted with a thousand years ago than with the present age, and yet better knowing how this world goeth than how his own wit runnneth; curious for antiquities and inquisitive of novelties; a wonder to younger folks and a tyrant to table talk, denieth, in a great chafe, that any man for teaching of virtue, and virtuous actions is comparable to him. (105)

In *The Sound of Virtue*, Blair Worden suggests that this is a disingenuous assertion, that "to Sidney's mind history is not the rival of poetry but its partner" (Worden 253). For Worden, Sidney's impressive knowledge of history and his ongoing interest in it make it impossible to think he understood history as standing in opposition with poetry. He does claim that Sidney understands certain particular distinctions between the two types of written work. Worden points out that *Arcadia* is a political and historical book, one that nonetheless uses poetry rather than history to achieve "delightful teaching" (qtd. in Worden 253). The reason, suggests Worden, is that Sidney thought of poetry as bound up with politics whereas history, in its punctilious adherence to detail, is not only a-political but a-social as well. Sidney is "at the birth of the 'politic' or 'civil' history, which, in the late sixteenth centuries, broke the antiquarian mould and invented, or reinvented, the science of politics" (Worden 255). Discussing *Arcadia* specifically, Worden suggests that Sidney believed that poetry reminds the reader to discern "fiction from fact" (Worden 265) rather than leading to false or fictional conclusions. Where facts, like the stuffy historian mentioned above, present the boring truth, the poet weaves a story designed to stir up interest and action.

Sidney's above assertion does mix the historian and the antiquarian, two figures Woolf spends some time distinguishing in "The Idea of History." The object of Sidney's attack also resembles the medieval historian as much as the early modern one. Indeed, Worden suggests that "The target of the *Defence* is ostensibly the historian, but really, in the term we would use, the antiquarian" (Worden 255). While there are historians who actually write about personal experiences (I will discuss this more in chapter three), according to Sidney, most histories are constructed through library and archival research. Is Sidney's notion of hearsay what Hakluyt would deem authentic first-hand accounts, or is it an attack on the medieval style chronicler? Hakluyt certainly resembles the man whose expertise rests on textual rather than experiental knowledge, but his collection is quite different from a medieval text. As I have mentioned, assessment of Hakluyt's work often looks to understand its participation in the building of empire and overseas expansion, a fact that, if it is possible to think of *Navigations* as a historical text, at least partially deflects Sidney's criticism of history. While Sidney may not necessarily suggest that poetry should supplant history, or vice versa, there is certainly a sense in his work that each genre achieves different things, thus making each genre appropriate for different textual and social purposes.

A similar stance is taken by Francis Bacon in *The Advancement of Learning*. While Bacon would oppose Sidney's conception of the historian, he shares Sidney's notion that different genres achieve different things. Bacon, however, was much more suspicious of poetry than Sidney. Contrary to the view that poetry inherently asked for historical support, Bacon suggested that poetry, used inappropriately, was a dangerous commodity:

> Poesy is a part of learning in measure of words for the most part restrained, but in all other points extremely licensed, and doth truly refer to the imagination; which, being not tied to the laws of matter, may at pleasure join that which nature hath severed, and sever that which nature hath joined; and so make unlawful matches and divorces of things.
> (Bacon, *Major Works* 186)

Both Sidney and Bacon reduce their respective straw men significantly. For Bacon, as for Sidney, poetry does not need to conform to physical reality. Poetry is capable of presenting inner or moral truth, but too often distorts physical reality. Bacon understands genre as something that needs to be appropriately married to form. Poetry specifically, because it is an imprecise medium, should be used to discuss things that we cannot know precisely, like God and the soul. In this way Bacon justifies the significant amount of poetry in the Bible, saying that it occurs "when the secrets and mysteries of religion, policy, or philosophy, are involved in fables or parables. Of this in divine poesy we see the use is authorized" (Bacon, *Works* 187). Bacon also understood genre through communities of readers. In *Literate Experience: The Work of Knowing in Seventeenth-century English Writing*, Andrew Barnaby & Lisa J. Schnell discuss Bacon's understanding of genre and community. They argue that for every discursive form there also needs to be an interpretive community along with it:

> the human-as-knower in the seventeenth century was more properly a social issue than a purely philosophical one. To seventeenth-century thinkers, solutions to the problems of 'right knowing' were intimately connected to a broader series of issues involving communities of knowledge and their knowers. (Barnaby & Schnell 2)[10]

Sidney would agree with Bacon, but in a slightly nuanced way. Further in *Defence of Poetry,* Sidney suggests that "of all writers under the Sunne, the Poet is the least lyer" (Sidney 114), but not because of an adherence to fact, but because of the poet's liberation from it. Bacon's attack is convincing, but Sidney suggests that poetry is the 'least lyer' because it never makes any claims to truth. While Bacon's thesis that poetry gives rise to idle fantasy was something with longstanding scholarly repute, Turbervile goes further by making speculation the content of his poem. He asks the reader to make a speculative leap. What the form or style might potentially lack in speculative power, the content urges. Turbervile's poem emphasizes the imaginative requirement of all reading. There is an implicit understanding that – for reasons political or ontological – the whole truth cannot be encapsulated within poetic language. *Navigations*, because it includes poetry, asserts that speculation is still a part of history and a part of understanding the world. The thematic movement of the poem is also similar to many non-fictional accounts, but its rhetorical interests are much more strident. There is no confusing the author's position regarding the Russians. This is not the most powerful example of sixteenth century poetry, but it is a far cry from the dull tone and indifferent prose of Davis' text.

---

[10] Some critics have suggested that Bacon was interested in returning language to its pre-lasarian state (Fudge 91-109).

Perhaps the most provocative moment of narrative diversity is a text regarding China, a text Hakluyt obtains from "the captured *Madre de Deus* in 1592" (Quinn, *Handbook* 427). According to Rogério Miguel Puga, the book was "Printed in Macao, a city belonging to the Portuguese in China . . . based on available information in the Jesuit circles" (Puga, 96-97). Puga states that only a section of the whole text is reprinted in *Navigations*, and that the section Hakluyt includes exhibits his "careful selection of materials and their interest for English merchants, as the translation only covers the most important section on China and the Portuguese presence and interaction with Chinese merchants" (Puga 97). It is written in the form of a dialogue, and in the tradition of many medieval dialogues, there are three characters, one who is the teacher or expert, of whom the others ask questions. The three participants are Michael (the teacher), Linus, and Leo. The banner before the dialogue claims it to be "An excellent treatise of the kingdome of *China,* and of the estate and gouernment thereof: Printed in Latine at *Macao* a citie of the *Portugals* in *China, An. Dom. 1590*, written "Dialogue-wise" (Hakluyt 1600, 88). In several cases Hakluyt includes two versions of the same narrative by the same author, one in the original, usually Latin, language, and one translated into contemporary English. In this case, the title significantly differs from many standard travel texts in its claim to textual quality rather than truthfulness. The information presented in the dialogue is very much like what is presented in a standard travel text. Michael describes the customs, population, geography, political structure, commodities, education, heads of state, and religious practices of China.

As a historical document the text does an admirable job of presenting information about the country in question. The use of the dialogue form asks readers to encounter the content of the narrative quite differently. As dialogue form often deals with philosophical or theological issues (Burke 1989, 2), this overtly fictional move – and it is the lone example of a dialogue in *Navigations* – shifts the effect of form, genre, and content. In "The Renaissance Dialogue," Peter Burke suggests that there are four general forms of the dialogue, but it is a form widely used in the early modern period. The most popular types of dialogue are "The catechism, the drama, the disputation and the conversation" (Burke 3). Of these four forms, the dialogue included in *Navigations* is a catechism, where one master speaker ostensibly lectures with brief interjections or questions from the others. The first question Linus asks Michael expresses concerns about form and content, and constructs an audience and reader expectation:

> **Linus.** Concerning the kingdome of China (Michael) which is our next neighbour, we have heard and daily do heare so many reports, that we are to request at your hands rather a true then a large discourse and narration thereof. And if there be ought in your knowledge besides that which by continual rumours is waxen stale among us, we will right gladly give diligent ear unto it. (Hakluyt 1598, 88)

This is a direct question to the master, a request to bypass rumor and present the truth about their neighbor to the west. But the demand is not only for an accurate history, but also for a brief and entertaining one. Excessive rumor makes the substance of history 'waxen stale.' The dialogue form allows for the configuration of a reader, and the reader's predicament and desires. Here the audience as historical character can directly express a desire for a specific kind of accuracy and authority. The request reflexively comments on the state of history proper, suggesting that the abundance of text is as much obfuscatory as it is informative.

The demand itself demonstrates a common request on storytellers. Think of the Host Harry Baily's desire in *The Canterbury Tales* for stories that are playful and serious, "Bitwix ernest and game" (Chaucer, *Complete Poetry and Prose* 172), or Thomas More's suggestion that Raphael Hythloday "urge [his] case vigorously but tactfully" (More, *Utopia* 36). In each of these cases, the stories presented are fictional in content, but outline certain moral and social positions through the fictional characters. With this dialogue the fictional characters describe accurately the culture and geography of China, but ask for a measure of quality or entertainment in the writing. Leo and Linus want more than straightforward data, more than a logbook that presents simply "the true course, & c" (Hakluyt 1600, 115-118).

The dialogue inadvertently makes some interesting comments on Hakluyt's project. Both Michael and Hakluyt appear to agree about the polyphony of history, but the request that Michael be brief casts a strange shadow over *Navigations*. One could assume that Linus and Leo would be somewhat dissatisfied with the length of Hakluyt's tome. Michael's acceptance of the limitations placed on him by Leo and Linus shows his tacit agreement with their position. Hakluyt gleans historical information from sources contrary to Michael's council, and includes narratives with varying degrees of rhetorical competence. *Navigations* also presents history as a manifold and multiple in both form and content – not consistent like Michael's. *Navigations* deliberately resists synthesizing the multiple sources into one narrative. By including this dialogue in *Navigations* Hakluyt asks a pressing question of his own text: how is it possible to read *Navigations* with its 'many reports' and wealth of 'rumour'? The dialogical register of the text emerges here somewhat. I will show in more detail in chapter Four, *Navigations* participates in a dialogue with itself and with texts outside of itself. Michael responds to Leo and Linus confidently, suggesting that he will be able to present what they want. Michael suggests that the current narratives regarding China are stale and inaccurate:

> the report of this most famous kingdom is growen so common among us, reducing diverse and manifold particulars into order, [that] I will especially aime at the trueth of things received from the fathers of societie, which even now at this present are conversant in China. (Hakluyt 1598, 88)

Michael's response partially answers why Hakluyt would include this dialogue in *Navigations*, and further suggests a reason for the many other structural anomalies therein. There is no question that this dialogue disrupts the steady flow of other potentially more boring narratives. Like Sidney's interest in presenting something lively, this dialogue contrasts sharply with the texts that surround it. The dialogue not only prevents the description of China from becoming common, but prevents the reading of *Navigations* from doing the same. Michael is doing for *Navigations* what he does for Leo and Linus. Michael's criticism of the commonality of stories regarding China rails against order, and I would argue that Hakluyt's text does the same. He suggests that commonality of narrative reduces the 'diverse' and 'manifold' elements into order. Michael says that the truth is necessarily complex and multiple, and his sources, 'the *fathers* of society,' suggest a multiplicity rather than a singular source. He, familiar with the fathers' teaching, is uniquely capable of synthesizing these manifold sources into a concise narrative.

There appears to be an inherent contradiction embedded within the logic of Michael's discourse as well. While he says that history is manifold and difficult, he also presumes to synthesise it into an understandable narrative for Leo and Linus. How is it possible to synthesize without destroying the multiplicity inherent in history he finds so valuable? Like the debate in chapter one between new-world discoveries and old-world systems of representation, Michael's dialogue bridges the gap between the principles of early modern and medieval methods of history, and therefore, so too does *Navigations*. The reflexivity inherent in the dialogue shows that the form and content of *Navigations* are unstable; and this is precisely the radical and productive lesson of Hakluyt's hybrid editing practice. There is no singular way of, or single form for, writing history. The inclusion of various writing techniques and forms endorses each form while acknowledging its contingent status. The formal engagement of the dialogue borrows elements from the medieval conventions of historical writing but it signals a radical break as well. Michael's synthesis is very much an innovation of historical narrative, taking the work of former masters and creating in effect a new history. But the text follows principles of accretion as well as subtraction. There is no interest in displacing the so-called fathers' authority, but Michael does intend to remove either the common texts, or the commonality from the story. By sprucing up the narrative of China, Michael potentially leaves the texts intact, but creates a new and more entertaining way of receiving it.

The answer to this paradox again comes from the formal attributes of the text. The dialogue gestures outside of itself in two ways: it presents speech as an alternate authority and points out the participatory nature of history. Michael makes a hermeneutical claim that the received history of China, the one Leo and Linus complain about, has grown common. Michael calls on readers to be vigilant in their participation in history, making sure to keep narratives fresh and conversant. Resisting the urge to reduce a manifold truth to an ordered system means participating in the dialogue, asking questions, and arguing with the authorities. It is clear that accurate history comes from a specific source, from people who are conversant with China, but in the dialogue this information not only becomes conversant but is conversation. There is a fluidity to the discussion under the guise of dialogue, where the receivers of history participate in the history they receive, and the structure of discourse is movement rather than stasis.

Michael receives this information from more than one scholarly father. This source of authority hints also at an oral authority rather than a textual one. There is at least a hint of a kind of plurality here, that there are multiple fathers for this story, but also that there is a consensus amongst the fatherly authority, much like the textual collation Sebastian Cabot urges of Hugh Willoughby. Michael does not go to one authoritative source, but to the collective wisdom of the Jesuit society, which will restore history from its 'particular' and 'order[ed]' status to something 'diverse' and 'manifold'. In both cases there is no singular, hard reality, but a manifold 'agreed upon' reality that incorporates objectivity and subjectivity.

Through the dialogue form in *Navigations* we can come to a clearer notion of Sidney's participatory relationship between history and poetry. While the dialogue form is not poetry, it certainly falls on the side of fiction similarly to poetry. The demands of Leo and Linus here gesture towards the similar interests of Sidney: that poetry, or fiction, is capable of presenting a kind of history that is more entertaining, if perhaps less factual, than history proper. Leo and Linus seem to be frustrated with people who look an awful lot like the stodgy old historians, the object of Sidney's jibes. Important is the fact that Hakluyt includes both in *Navigations*, and is clearly in league with Sidney's notion of history working along side of poetry. The dedication of the 1582 edition of *Divers Voyages* to Sidney indicates more than simple attention to social decorum, but also indicates a strong sense of shared textual purpose.

The interest in different textual forms shows Hakluyt's attention to the significatory properties of fiction and history, and, like Sidney, Hakluyt asserts a different but equivalent value to each. But Hakluyt does not stop here, and is generous regarding the limitations of his own book. The various formal engagements in *Navigations* and the introductory commentary demonstrate both Hakluyt's valuation of foreign narratives and the limitations of his own collection:

> And albeit my worke do carry the title of The English Voyages, as well in

> regard that the greatest part are theirs, and that my travaile was chiefly undertaken for the preservation of their memorable actions, yet where our own mens experience is defective, there I have bene careful to supply the same with the best and chiefest relations of strangers. (Hakluyt 1600, *2r)

Hakluyt is acknowledging the limitations of English experience, perhaps an odd thing for a propagandist to do, and suggests that it is possible to fill in these gaps with narratives from other nations. Hakluyt overtly states that foreign narratives are important documents to understand the history of new-world, and old-world, discoveries. But he is not presenting the possibility of total knowledge here; that is, he is not suggesting that foreign narratives can supplement English texts to present a complete picture of the social and natural world. Rather, Hakluyt is hinting at the inherent partial, "defective" quality of all narrative. Concluding that the representation of reality in texts is inherently defective requires careful consideration of how the details should be organized, something I will deal with at length in chapter four.

The various critical assessments of *Navigations* show a multiple and split critical perspective that expresses itself in content and form. The diversity of the formal interests shakes the perspective of the reader and aids in the defiance of a critical category. Critical interest in the years since *Navigations'* publication is as varied and diverse as the text itself. We can see now that under the aesthetic terms he constructs, Parks' dismissal of Froude's assessment that *Navigations* is a 'prose epic' is in fact correct. *Navigations* is not a prose epic, but not because it fails to live up to the rigours of epic form, but rather because the limitations of epic make it a wholly insufficient term to capture all that is *The Navigations*.

Seeing the Actual story
Changes what is seen

b.p. Nichol

The World is all that is the Case

Ludwig Wittgenstein

Chapter III

Study of the case: what does discovery discover?

The first two chapters of this project have focussed on Hakluyt's position in the historical tradition of history writing, his practices in compiling *Navigations*, his investment in narrative forms, and the various ways in which his work has been received. In each of these areas a central concern of mine has been the ways in which text mediates material experience. In this chapter I will undertake a more thorough case study of several narratives contained within the collection. My interest is still in understanding the ways in which material experience is mediated through texts, but the focus here is more directly centred on a few particular narratives. I am here making a further, if somewhat pedantic, distinction between text and narrative. In an effort to distinguish between the multi-sourced and single-sourced texts in *Navigations*, and to discuss the cumulative affect of reading multiple texts, something I will call a hermeneutical progression, I will designate text as a material thing – the text as a particular series of words contained in *Navigations* – while narrative is what arises from the reading of multiple texts. At the end of chapter two I suggested that Hakluyt's editorial commentary urged the reader to explore texts outside of *Navigations*, and, while there will be some supplementary travel texts that I will consult, I will confine my reading primarily to narratives contained within

Navigations. Each case study contains multiple voyages and often multiple texts from any individual voyage. Through each case study I will show points of contention and convergence in each text, a textual play that complicates the construction of a narrative.

I will begin with the narrative and textual history of Anthony Jenkinson's voyage to Russia, and the social circumstances surrounding the political interaction between England and Russia and Jenkinson's move to open trade routes to the Far East. From there I will move to the texts included in *Navigations* devoted to the discovery of a northwest passage, discussing both the many voyages undertaken in the search of the Northwest Passage and the circumstances surrounding the interest in and value of such a discovery. In each of these voyages the formal elements of the texts are basically the same. Each narrator constructs what I called in the last chapter a standard text, presenting a text from a specific viewpoint. And while we can assume that many of the texts that eventually make it into *Navigations* are collations of an absent series of ur-narratives – through the discussion of Sebastian Cabot's instructions to Hugh Willoughby in Chapter One – there are texts that also clearly come from a single source. I will examine single source narratives balanced against multiple-source narratives to theorize the cumulative affect as an interaction between text, narrative, and experience. The formal repetition presents a very different picture of this interaction from earlier chapters while grappling with similar questions. Consecutive presentation of the voyages in *Navigations* allows a reading of the development of knowledge within texts, how narratives interact with and know each other. This sort of reading gives access to a textual and historical consciousness, and to the potential unconscious of texts.

Anthony Jenkinson: History in the Margins

Navigations includes four voyages by Jenkinson, all of which are motivated by trade. Jenkinson plays the double role of representative of the Muscovy Company and representative of the queen, the latter apparently to satisfy Ivan Vasilyvich's (Tsar Ivan IV) objection to anyone other than royalty or official representatives thereof gaining audience. The Muscovy Company was a trade conglomerate that allowed multiple people to purchase and interest in specific mercantile exploits. There were many different investors in Jenkinson's Russia voyages (Willian *Russia Company* and *Muscovy Merchants*, and Staples). The first narrative is the most thorough, clearly illustrating a mercantile interest and the stark difference between the bustling capitalist drive of England and a more feudalist Russia (Eowmianski, and Geckov). Jenkinson's voyage is designed to initiate communication and trade with Russia, but is primarily focussed on securing safe passage down the Volga – a river only four years in Russian control – to investigate possible trade with Persia and beyond. As a representative of Queen Elizabeth, Jenkinson needs to act as diplomat as well as merchant, a job more complex than simply presenting a list of goods for trade. After the Muscovy Company's first emissary to Russia, Richard Chancellor, drowns in a shipwreck off the Scottish coast, Jenkinson bears the burden of re-establishing diplomatic relations. Jenkinson's texts are a wealth of information, providing detailed diplomatic, geographic, cultural, and cartographic information, and serve as social and political templates for future voyages.

Jenkinson makes four voyages to Russia, each with its own specific goals and achievements. The trajectory of the four voyages shows a peculiar textual and narrative development. On one level the individual texts of the various voyages work sympathetically, building a narrative of the voyage, each filling in factual gaps for the other. But the double narratives, while each at times confirms the claims made by its doppelganger, often contradict each other. With this the coherent picture gets bumped or thrown out of focus. Because there are multiple ships on each voyage there are a number of texts for each of Jenkinson's four voyages. For each voyage Hakluyt includes an official text that comes from Jenkinson's own ship, but also includes at least one other text and at times several. The duplication asks interesting questions about the structure of history and the ability of any text to adequately capture experience. Through an analysis of the points of convergence and divergence in multiple texts of the same voyage along with the diachronic progression of subsequent voyages, I will show how textual construction weaves together a narrative of the voyage, a narrative that stands outside of each individual text but simultaneously shows textual cooperation and repression.

The first text from Jenkinson describes the commodities of Russia, the experience with the Tsar, and the trials and tribulations of getting there, something the later texts bypass. Jenkinson's four voyages are chronologically re-presented in *Navigations*, with texts from other voyagers to Russia and Persia inserted in between, demonstrating the fruits of Jenkinson's diplomatic and mercantile efforts. Jenkinson's texts show a development in knowledge through the shifting concerns with exploration and discovery in successive texts. The texts that supplement Jenkinson's official version of events come from a variety of sources. On Jenkinson's first voyage to Russia the second text comes from Russian Ambassador Osep Gregorevitch Nepea, an inclusion that adds an interesting cultural perspective as well. Jenkinson is charged with returning Nepea to Russia, and there are moments where he is aboard the same ship as Jenkinson. The text is reprinted from the manuscript and there is some dispute as to how Hakluyt obtained it. In *The Hakluyt Handbook,* D. B. Quinn speculates that "Hakluyt may have obtained this from Jenkinson rather than from the Muscovy Company archives" (355). The second voyage is structured much like the first and demonstrates similar navigational concerns. The third is almost a footnote, comprising one short paragraph only. The fourth repeats the thematical interest of the first narrative (the central concern reverting back to diplomacy) as by 1572, the date of his final voyage, certain social and economic issues have ruffled the feathers of both countries.

In most of the texts there is a significant amount of factual detail that gets repeated. The texts from the first voyage follow a standard format. The title states that the narrative to follow is "A compendios and briefe declaration of the iourney of M. *Anth.*

Ienkinson, from the famous citie of *London* into the land of *Persia,* passing in this same iourney thorow *Russia, Moscouia,* and *Mare Caspium*" (Hakluyt 1598, 343). It also states the date, 1561, and the place of departure, London. Although the stated mandate is for "the discoverie of Lands, Islands, &.C," the fact that the project is underwritten by the Society of Merchants and Adventurers makes it clear that trade is an integral interest. The second text from the first voyage declares a different mandate in its title: "The voyage, wherein Osep Napea the Moscouite Ambassadour returned home into his countrey, with his entertainement at his arriuall, at *Colmogro:* and a large description of the maners of the Countrey" (Hakluyt 1598, 321).[11] Unlike other travel texts included in *Navigations,* there is no mention of the captain of the ship, who is aboard the vessel, or whether it is a part of a different convoy. Only after reading Jenkinson's text do we discover that for a part of the journey, Osep Nepea in fact traveled with Jenkinson. When leaving England, the ambassador sailed aboard Jenkinson's ship, and departed with a small group of men once they arrived in Kholmogory. The texts converge for a short time when they arrive together in St Nicholas,[12] and once again when both Jenkinson and the ambassador reach Moscow. Outside of these moments, the two writers display diverse textual choices. While both sail together from London, the ambassador's text essentially begins with the fleet's arrival in St. Nicholas. Apart from a brief explanation of when they depart, who they are transporting, and what ships are along on the voyage, Nepea's text drops more than two months of the voyage, abandoning the narrative on May 12th and picking it up again on July 13th. In this section, narrative veracity turns on the cumulative effect of the two texts. Here there is a parallel and diachronic structure to *Navigations*, where one text relies upon the other. The story that emerges from the double narrative is produced by each text, extending the individual texts beyond themselves.

---

[11] Jenkinson and Hakluyt have variant spellings for the Russian Ambassador's name. I will use Nepea unless I am citing from the source text.

[12] There is a short hitch here. While Jenkinson's narrative suggests that the fleet delivers the ambassador on the 12th of July, the narrative describing the acts of the ambassador state they arrive on the 13th.

The month absent in Nepea's text fills several pages in Jenkinson's and relays many details including direction and distance travelled. Jenkinson includes islands encountered, various natural peculiarities, and near disasters all absent from the Nepea's text. Jenkinson recounts the story of the Primrose running aground "vpon a sand called the blacke taile" (Hakluyt 1598, 310), and of a peculiar – and eventually famous – whirlpool located off the north west coast of Norway now called the Maelstrom:

> there is between the said *Rost* Islands & *Lofoot,* a whirle poole called *Malestrand,* which from halfe ebbe vntill halfe flood, maketh such a terrible noise, that it shaketh the ringes in the doores of the inhabitants houses of the sayd Islands tenne miles off. Also if there commeth any Whale within the current of the same, they make a pitifull crie. Moreouer, if great trees be caried into it by force of streams, and after with the ebbe be cast out againe, the ends and boughs of them haue bene so beaten, that they are like the stalkes of hempe that is bruised. (Hakluyt 1598, 312)

This is a rather short entry, about which nothing else is said, and would appear tangential were it not for the example of the tree, which works as a warning about the damage the whirlpool could do to a ship. The precise nature of the information given in the first text underscores the thesis of Cribb and others who suggest that the texts in *Navigations* were designed to be didactic. The detail in this text would certainly be useful for future voyages.

The two texts converge again when the fleet arrives at Saint Nicholas, but certain members of the retinue depart from here at different times. While the ambassador's people leave on July 20, Jenkinson's fleet remains until August 1. Both groups take the same route and display a remarkable consistency in travel time. Jenkins's fleet makes the trip in 36 days and the ambassador, perhaps less interested in trade possibilities along the way, makes it in 29. Neither text makes any reference to climate or wind, surprising since this is a staple of most initial travel texts, and only Jenkinson discusses various natural obstacles that later voyagers will encounter. Jenkinson includes details such as the depth of the river Dwina, which is "verie shallow, and stonie, and troublesome for Barkes and boats … to passe that way" (Hakluyt 1598, 311), requiring the party to move through the river in Russian boats called "Nassades, and Doneckes" (Hakluyt 1598, 311). While Jenkinson makes clear what is in store for future voyagers, his text also includes a measure of wonder at that he is experiencing because he is experiencing Russia for the first time. He describes the river, the various flora and fauna on the way, and even the state of the riverbank, stating that "on both sides of the mouth of this river called Pinego [a tributary to the Dwina] is high land, great rocks of Alablaster, great woods and pineapple trees lying along within the ground, which by report have lien there since Noes flood" (Hakluyt 1598, 311). Jenkinson uses a Biblical reference to contextualize his experience without straying from his mercantile mandate; he references both the wonder of salvation and Noah's flood and lists valuable commodities like Alabaster. Nepea's text, on the other hand, bypasses these descriptions almost entirely. The reference to an anonymous report shows that Jenkinson is using an outside source without mentioning what exactly it is (most likely some oral tradition as signified by the reference "by Report"). The very gesture implies an outside of the text that endorses his claim, something that underwrites the post-diluvian rebirth of the natural world he is experiencing. Jenkinson's use of biblical imagery to describe the state of the mouth of the river asserts that it not only appears new, but that in some sense it *is* new, the last thing to touch it the hand of the divine.

On more practical matters, Jenkinson includes references to specific places, a list of significant stops on the way to Moscow, and various available commodities; he lists all of the rivers and their tributaries as well as the cities and the distances between them. By contrast, Nepea's text is quite pared down, most likely because his perspective is that of someone much more experienced. Nepea's familiarity with his surroundings, and perhaps the assumption that his reader will also be familiar with these surroundings, allows him the freedom to exclude what Jenkinson feels necessary to include. Nepea's familiarity with his surroundings is similar to the complaint of textual rumour that is 'waxen stale' (see chapter two, 113). Nepea reduces the manifold landscape to the ordinary precisely because it is common. Their mutual inclusion in *Navigations* not only highlights a cultural difference, but creates a narrative from the two texts that is exclusive from both as well. These two texts combine to construct a narrative that potentially fills out an event in a way that is both and neither. A continuous reading of these texts gives the reader a double perspective that fuses into an image, or narrative monad of the voyage. Hakluyt's editorial tactic creates a text that supersedes itself; in effect, he paves the way for the multiple texts to morph into narratives.

After they describe their arrival in the Russian court the texts are quite similar in the events they emphasize. Both are similarly invested in diplomatic relations, differing only slightly in presentation. There are a few signature events that each narrative covers. Both describe the arrival and meeting with the king, the lavish Christmas dinner they both attend, and a peculiar mass christening ritual. Jenkinson makes clear the date, the 25th of December, suggesting that this is the day the Russians celebrate the birth of Christ. The ambassador's narrative simply states that they are "willed to dine with the Emperor" on "Christmas day" (Hakluyt 1598, 317). Jenkinson appears to be concerned with the accuracy of the date, a consideration that would grow in importance as the

Russian culture lags far behind the English in their adoption of the Gregorian calendar.[13] This seems merely a semantic distinction since it is clear that the event is important to both because of the mutual detailed description.

This is the first formal meeting with the Tsar for Jenkinson, and he repeats several observations made chronologically earlier in the ambassador's text. His description of the King and his retinue is nearly identical to the ambassador's description:

> First at the vpper end of one table were set the Emperour his maiestie, his brother, & the Emperour of *Cazan,* which is prisoner. About two yardes lower sate the Emperour of *Cazan* his sonne, being a child of fiue yeeres of age, and beneath him sate the most part of the Emperors noble men. (Hakluyt 1598, 315)

Both narratives draw attention to the ceremony, pointing out the hierarchical social structure, and include the presence of the prisoner, acknowledging military prowess and decorum. While there is some difference in the content of each text, the repetition of this particular scene does seem a bit extraneous. One could suggest that the ambassador's text is included as an example of a higher aesthetic product, something that devalues the aesthetic reception of Jenkinson's text while simultaneously endorsing content, something like Linus' desire for a history told well. But one could also argue that aesthetic strength or weakness does virtually nothing to the content of the text itself. This double scene does show a space where the two narratives seem to mis-recognize one another. Behind the individual texts is the editor and compiler, Hakluyt, who recognizes deficiencies in content and rhetorical ability.

---

[13] Neither culture is quick to pick up this innovation, however. Pope Gregory's correction of the Julian calendar in 1582 is adopted by England in 1752, but not in Russia until 1918 (Blackburn and Holford-Strevens 687).

Jenkinson's account of the second voyage retains much of the formal structure of his account of the first but is much more streamlined, much closer to Nepea's text from the first voyage. He passes through Russia, citing simply his stops at locations described in detail in the previous text. Jenkinson mentions the diplomatic protocol of receiving permission to pass through Russia and his diplomatic relations with the Tsar and ambassador Osep Nepea, the same man he dropped off a year earlier. The second text also does more than encourage further trade with Russia and Persia; it opens the floodgates of English-Russian trade, or at least the structure of *Navigations* demonstrates this eventuality. After Jenkinson's second voyage, which extends through Russia to Persia, Hakluyt includes the economic concessions granted by 'Abd al-'Alî Khân, the then king of Gîlân, and five separate texts of voyages to Persia follow before the very brief text of Jenkinson's third voyage (Ferrier 48-66). The text of Jenkinson's second voyage mentions letters of passage he obtains for English merchants Thomas Alcock, George Wrenne, and Richard Chenie, letters that secure stable and open trade in Russia. This reference serves as an introduction to the narratives of Thomas Alcock, Richard Johnson, Arthur Edwards, and several others, all of whom participate in the ensuing trade with Russia. Other than Edwards' narrative, where Thomas Alcock is killed, the narratives that follow are undramatic. All are oriented entirely around mercantile concerns, discuss commodities for export and import, and spend much time clearing up discrepancies in currency and weights and measures. The lists are exhaustive, since currency and weights vary from place to place and from year to year. While Jenkinson's second narrative is still exploratory, one that describes landmarks, distances (often in days of travel rather than measures of distance, something the merchant Arthur Edwards calculates in 1567), and potential hazards both natural and human, the texts from the merchants that follow show the fruit of Jenkinson's diplomatic and geographical work. While Jenkinson does engage in successful trade, he is the primary diplomat and a kind of natural and social cartographer for the English in subsequent voyages to Russia, and Hakluyt presents his value as such, blazing a path for safe travel and commerce.

The text of Jenkinson's entire third voyage comprises one paragraph only. There is no clear indication of how long the stay lased but the text does indicate his departure from England and arrival in Moscow. The voyage lasted a little more than three months and serves as an introduction for the most significant achievement of the trip, an official document listing the 'priviledges' granted by the Russian emperor to English merchants. The completion of this document was supposed to secure stable trade between Russia and England for years to come. The trajectory of the narratives shows an increasing familiarity, and the texts become shorter and shorter. This textual streamlining ceases in the fourth text, however, where the misunderstood content of the first voyage reveals itself.

The inclusion of the double description of the first voyage presents in part a hitch in perception, a moment of double vision or deja vu. And while this seems to demonstrate the consistency of perception within *Navigations*, there is an echo of this moment that takes place on Jenkinson's fourth voyage to Russia. There is no evidence from the first three texts, and the numerous texts from other explorers interspersed throughout, that anything is awry. But it is here that we can see the limitations of a hermeneutical reading, where the three texts collectively present a coherent, consistent, and transparent story. England appears to be on good terms with Russia and its Tsar until Jenkinson's fourth voyage. When approaching Moscow, Jenkinson traditionally sent his translator ahead to inform the Russian Tsar of his impending arrival (a detail omitted until the fourth narrative). In each of his previous voyages, an audience with the Tsar soon followed. In the final text, however, Jenkinson relays how his translator comes back with disturbing news:

> I did well perceiue by the wordes of the sayd Agent and others your

> seruants, that I was entred into great perill and danger of my life: for they reported to mee that they heard said at the *Mosco,* that the princes displeasure was such against me, that if euer I came into his countrey againe, I should loose my head. (Hakluyt 1598, 402)

Jenkinson boldly moves ahead in the face of this danger, feeling that his past good conduct and favourable meetings with the Tsar will prevent any harm from coming to him. He eventually does meet the Tsar again and discovers that his initial voyages did not do the diplomatic work he initially thought. Ivan claims that the other merchants that come to Russia do not behave in an appropriate manner. In the initial meeting with Jenkinson, Ivan, through the extravagance of his reception, asserts the importance of courtly protocol. In Jenkinson's fourth visit to Russia, Ivan explicitly reemphasizes this diplomatic and courtly demand, stating that "first princes affaires are to be established, and then Merchants" (Hakluyt 1598, 403). The relationship between Ivan and some of the merchants deteriorates so far that one merchant is captured accused of having letters "written much against our [the Tsar's] Princely estate" (Hakluyt 1598, 403).

Ivan's action and comments point to a missing element in the diplomatic relationship between Russia and England that can be traced back to the initial meeting. A hermeneutical analysis of the progression of events and the development of a social and mercantile relationship would demonstrate how a horizon of perspective gleaned from previous interaction leads to particular social engagements. Applying this to texts, the problem that arises in the fourth text is that what occurs in the fourth text does not seem to be overtly predicated on the previous three. By the fourth voyage it is clear that something has gone wrong in the relationship between Jenkinson and Ivan, and it is also obvious that Jenkinson is surprised by the Tsar's declaration. The horizon of perspective that Jenkinson thinks should precede his arrival in Russia is certainly disrupted, but not enough to make him turn back. The disruption of narrative coherence can be explained through a double-handed theoretical application of Marxist ideology and psychoanalytical reading of repression and repetition.

In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Freud suggests that the only reason for a subject to repeat something is if they have forgotten the origin of the compulsion, i.e., they have repressed some trauma that returns in a compulsion to repeat. While there certainly are economic and social reasons for repeated voyages to Russia, the repeated narratives in Jenkinson's case show some latent, repressed content. Jenkinson's repetition fits loosely with Freud's assertion, as his later narratives often obliquely refer back to the initial meeting, suggesting that in meetings with the Tsar that he was treated "as before." Jenkinson repeats a description while at the same time refusing the full signification of the event. This textual move suggests that nothing new happens, that this is simply a repetition of an earlier ceremony that he and the reader are already familiar with. The Tsar has a starkly different feeling about his hospitality, thinking of each event as unique, deserving of appropriate attention. Jenkinson's partial re-presentation shows that he is not forgetting the event, but rather its social-symbolical significance. He does signal to his reader that there is a similar ceremony, but his re-presentation misses its symbolic value to the Tsar. This is what Jacques Lacan would call secondary repression, where the signifier is elided from the signifying chain (Lacan, *Ecrits* 322); this elision is not a removal but a metaphorical replacement, where one thing stands in for the other. Jenkinson's "as before" takes the place of several pages of text, indicating a partial repetition that leads to a return of the repressed content.

A further reason for Hakluyt to include both Jenkinson's and Nepea's texts now reveals itself. Earlier I suggested that Nepea's narrative glossed over elements of the voyage to Russia – or omitted them altogether – when passing through familiar territory. The later texts from Jenkinson do the same thing. The textual representation of Nepea's meeting with Tsar Ivan, however, maintains the same fidelity to detail as Jenkinson's text. Where Jenkinson is experiencing something for the first time, Nepea is representing a part of diplomatic life that surely he has experienced several times before. Nepea's textual homage to the Tsar illustrates a symbolic shift in the valuation of textual content, an acknowledgement that the significance of the event calls for careful detail. A meeting with the Tsar is a special event, and the textual attention that Nepea gives it shows that this experience is much different than other aspects of exploration or diplomacy. Jenkinson, after he meets the Tsar once, treats subsequent meetings textually like Nepea treats the landscape, like something known and therefore not worth repeating. Jenkinson's oblique references to subsequent meetings demonstrate his failure to accurately assess the cult of personality of the Tsar, a failure that textually and materially returns in an execution of an English merchant and threats upon Jenkinson's life. When Jenkinson finally gets an audience with the Tsar, Ivan wonders why Jenkinson himself had not returned sooner. Jenkinson in turn explains that he was sent to battle England's enemies, and that the problem with the merchants was either the fault of Russian messengers or problems with translation. What follows is a second trade agreement, sixteen articles from the English and sixteen from the Russians.

The absence of the proper protocol is certainly what upsets Ivan. But the absence is not simply material. Ivan does attach excessive value to each visit from Jenkinson, but it is not simply that Ivan wishes to have his ego flattered through excessive ceremonial pomp. There is a fundamental structural difference in the way the two people understand diplomatic interaction. It is in fact Jenkinson who fetishizes the ceremony, allowing one meeting to stand in textually (and apparently experientially) for all subsequent interactions. In securing a written trade agreement, Jenkinson assumes that this validates all English merchants, not just him. Jenkinson's textual universalization signals a misunderstanding of the significance of the event for him and for other English merchants. This textual event is evidence for – and perhaps gives rise to – the fetishization of the representativeness of English merchants. The meeting between Jenkinson and Ivan stands in for an authentic relationship between the Tsar and other merchants, a drastic overvaluation that leads to dire circumstances. Ivan conversely attaches significant value to the figure of Jenkinson, finding authenticity in the individual. The Tsar's attachment to Jenkinson makes it impossible, and perhaps transgressive, for any other person to fulfill the symbolic space inhabited by him. For the Tsar, Jenkinson possesses what Walter Benjamin would call an aura absent in any other emissary (Benjamin, *Illuminations* 220-222). The doubling of the initial event exposes the difference of perspective each narrator possesses. Here the textual give and take that worked so well to construct a coherent narrative earlier breaks down; the narrative arising from this duplication is something that requires a retroactive reading to fix meaning. The depth of the first text cannot be completely understood without its double, and the significance of the doubling cannot be completely be understood without following through and reading the texts of successive voyages, noting the changes and retroactively affixing meaning. Only after Ivan issues his threat upon Jenkinson's life does the full picture emerge out of the double narrative of Nepea and Jenkinson.

To return to a psychoanalytical reading of this textual presentation, the double texts and the progression of Jenkinson's series of texts outline a textual consciousness and unconsciousness. We can assume that certain things are experienced in a similar way on subsequent voyages, but because there is textual representation elsewhere there is no need for repetition. Freud suggests that consciousness and the unconscious is constructed through experienced reality:

> Speaking in Metapsychological terms, it [psychoanalysis] asserts that consciousness is a function of a particular system which it describes as C*s*. What consciousness yields consists essentially of perceptions of excitations coming from the external world and of feelings of pleasure and unpleasure which can only arise from within the mental apparatus. It is therefore possible to assign to the system *Pcpt Cs*. a position in space. It

> must lie on the borderline between outside and inside. (Freud, *Metapsychology* 295)

Freud goes on to suggest that the unconscious, while the seat of instincts and drives, is also a space where repressed material experience is hidden from consciousness; therefore, it too must lie on the borderline between outside and inside. Lacan develops this theory, suggesting that the unconscious is linguistic and that it is physically present but in a cyphered form: "The unconscious is the chapter of my history that is marked by a blank or occupied by a lie: it is the censored chapter. But the truth can be refound; most often it has already been written down elsewhere" (Lacan, *Ecrits* 215). Lacan's choice of words could not be more apt for the present textual situation. The different perspectives on diplomacy between Ivan and Jenkinson give rise to a textual repression, something that returns in the later narratives. Again, it is only after reading the entire series of texts that a clear picture of narrative consciousness can appear.

The fourth narrative deals with the return of the repressed and with the solution: the respective articles of conduct and the personal reconciliation between Jenkinson and Ivan. The crux of this repression is communicative but also mercantile, and it is possible to see the displacement that arises communicatively because of the difference in means of production. The relationship between Jenkinson and Ivan, where one sees a fetish and the other an aura, is grounded in the fundamental difference between capitalist and feudalist means of production. Where capitalism works to fetishize certain relationships, as Marx's analysis of the commodity fetish shows, feudalism, at least in part, understands authenticity through hierarchy. This is the reason why Jenkinson returns to the source, why it is he who sets things right between the two nations. Ivan's attachment to the subjective object of Jenkinson means that Jenkinson is the only one capable of restoring the balance. Jenkinson's misrecognition and repression of the difference in social decorum leads to a messy and dangerous return of the repressed. The final return to the same, his return to the diplomatic relations established fifteen years earlier, marks a clearer recognition of the other as other, an intersubjective relationship that was not enacted in the first meeting.

There are moments where social and cultural repression shows itself more clearly in the duplicate narratives, moments where events are repeated with changes in the symbolic content. There is a christening ritual that both Nepea and Jenkinson observe in the first set of texts, but the ways in which the events are presented are much different. There is little change in the content of the two versions of the event, but what is different indicates a divergence in the respective socio-cultural perspective of the two men. Both Jenkinson and Nepea begin with the date of the event, but Jenkinson, cognizant of his prospective audience, points out a discrepancy in the calendars of England and Russia. Jenkinson says that the event happens on January 4th of the English calendar, which transcribes to January 12th of the Russian calendar. Nepea simply gives the 12th as the date. Here Jenkinson's narrative serves as a template for reading the ambassador's, filling in certain gaps in the later narrative.

Both texts describe the event similarly. Both Nepea and Jenkinson describe a ritual procession to a river next to the town. The procession follows a lengthy church service, and the Tsar leads the procession on a horse, dressed in full regalia. Ivan is followed by his household, then soldiers, and finally Jenkinson and the townspeople. Once the group reaches the river, a hole is cut in the ice, and the Metropolitan (the Bishop at the head of the local church heirarchy) ritually blesses the water and uses it to bless first the king, and then the rest of the *regis familia*. Once this is performed, the rest of the crowd are granted access to the water, most of them blessing themselves by bathing in the water.

At first glance the ceremony appears to be nothing more than a strange mass blessing. There is a distinction that demonstrates a social hierarchy; the Tsar is blessed first, then the retinue, and finally the townspeople. Again, the parallel presentation of the two texts gives insight into the social perspectives of the two narrators. There is a peculiar racial distinction in Jenkinson's version that is absent in Nepea's. Jenkinson states that the Tsar is dressed in a "tartarian" fashion, and that "divers Tartars [are] christened" (Hakluyt 1598, 313). This is not an idle assertion since both narratives, when discussing the guest list of the Christmas dinner, distinguish between Tartars, foreigners, and Russians. Jenkinson also distinguishes between the blessing of the Tsar and the christening of the Tartars. Nepea, on the other hand, carefully describes the religious ritual, suggesting that the king is dressed in full regalia with his crown on his head. For the ambassador, the ritual is beautiful, "wonderful to behold" (Hakluyt 1598, 317), a ritual of social, cultural, and racial confederation. He also describes how many of the people are free from clothing (both men women and children), and even the horses are given access to the blessed water, to "make their horses as holy as themselves" (Hakluyt 1598, 317). The difference here is a slight matter of degree. Both seem to describe a sense of community, but Jenkinson's description marks the occasion as a kind of conversion, where Tartars are brought into the fold, while at the same time registering a sense of unease at the attire of the king. Only Jenkinson describes the event in racial terms, which in turn leaves open the question of Jenkinson's perception of tarters and "tartairan."

There are many references to Tartars throughout *Navigations* as a whole and in Jenkinson's writings specifically. The 1558 voyage in particular presents how erratic he finds so–called Tartarian behaviour to be. Generally he takes a dim view of anything Tartar, suggesting that Tartars are "men of warre" and "given much to theft and murder" (Hakluyt 1598, 327), but Jenkinson does acknowledge, if somewhat provisionally, a softer side to the Tartars. One faithful member of his crew who happened to be a Tartar convinces a band of raiders (also Tartars) to let Jenkinson and his crew go. Later, when the group eventually are robbed, Jenkinson meets with a "Prince called Timor Soltan" who returns the stolen property with an assurance of safe passage. Jenkinson's fair treatment by the sultan could potentially lead to a more positive view of the Tartars, but after the return of his stolen artefacts he suggests that it was in fact the sultan who had ordered the raid on his party in the first place, saying that the same sultan's "commaundement was, that [Jenkinson] should have beene robbed and destroyed" (Hakluyt 1598, 328). Jenkinson is rather proud of his diplomatic achievement, likening this escape to his dealings with Ivan. The sultan orders Jenkinson's murder just as Ivan had, and it is Jenkinson's silver tongue and diplomatic aplomb that allow him to escape with his negative opinion of Tartars intact.

The subtle rhetorical differences between the two texts illustrate the different social, racial, and sexual concerns of the two narrators. Both narratives maintain social status or class differences, each distinguishing the monarch, priests, and lower royalty from the masses and soldiery, but there are details of the event in each account that signify very differently in the two texts. The ambassador creates a kind of equivalence between the bathers, crossing gender, social, and even species boundaries. Only the ambassador states that the horses are baptised and the significance this holds for the riders. He is also the only one to state that many of the bathers are naked. In Nepea's version of events, the horses become as holy as the riders, and the riders, free from clothing, approach an animal-like state. Jenkinson prudishly makes no mention of this boundary crossing, omitting any mention of blessed horses or naked men and women. But Jenkinson's omission of any direct reference to the naked bathers is not because of tolerance or uninterest. His interest is registered rather in a coded manner. Jenkinson sums up the behaviour of the participants with a single adjective, calling their actions Tartarian. This little bit of shorthand displaces a significant amount of detail while simultaneously calling into play a host of unfavourable characteristics. And while Jenkinson's text shows a certain amount of repression with the invocation of the term, the existence of the ambassador's narrative exposes this repressed content.

Within the context of Jenkinson's texts alone, the term Tartar suggests deceptive, heathenish, and erratic behaviour. Any moment where Tartars act in a helpful or honest way is quickly recast as anomalous and inconsistent with their true character. The narrative that begins to emerge from a reading of the ambassador's and Jenkinson's texts demonstrates a further elaboration of meaning. The double narrative makes nakedness akin to being Tartar, the absence of clothing signifying a specific racial identity. There is no mention of the race of the bathers in the ambassador's narrative, but Jenkinson makes naked people Tartars and Tartars naked. This doubling presents a too full reality as well, and indicates a specific shift in perspective. Reading the two texts together not only creates a narrative that is different from either of the individual texts, but allows the reader to more accurately place the ideological position of each narrator. The multiple texts represent a narrative consciousness and unconsciousness. The manifest content of each individual text exhumes the latent, repressed content of the other. Only through Nepea's text is it possible to understand what Jenkinson means by Tartarian in this specific moment. As before, one narrative fills in a gap in the other, but more specifically, here Nepea's text exposes the latent content of Jenkinson's narrative. The repressed content of the specific signifier is shown only through textual duplication. Reading the two texts creates a narrative for the reader, one that possesses the knowledge of each individual text's repressed content.

Orchestrating Repetition, Three Travellers

One early modern navigational preoccupation that held sway over the imaginations of the English was the quest to find a stable route to India. The number of voyages that set out to find a northwest passage are interesting source material for a discussion of repetition. Because of benefits specific to England, for many years the exploration of a northwest passage remained primarily an English preoccupation. A southern route to India meant facing the difficulties of passing through dangerous

Spanish seas. The possibility of bypassing these geopolitical and navigational difficulties made northern travel to India quite attractive. There were competing interests in both northwest and northeast passages, including the efforts by Jenkinson and others to discover a route that combined sea travel and an overland route through Persia. While there were many who endorsed northeast exploration over northwest (Humphrey Gilbert, Luke Fox, and James West to name a few), the most significant attempts generally come in the seventeenth century, after many failed attempts in search of the Northwest Passage and the publication of *Navigations*. In the end, the spectacular failures of English attempts to outflank the Spanish by means of the discovery of a northest passage were offset only by the spectacular successes of Francis Drake's expeditions around Cape horn to plunder fat Spanish galleons off the west coast of South America.

Confined to the first hundred years of failure, *Navigations* contains only a cross section of these endeavours, but still manages to contain many harrowing narratives. In spite of some catastrophic failures, the preoccupation with the discovery of the Northewest Passage persisted until a path was finally traversed by sea, a feat not accomplished until 1905. It was not until 1944 that any ship successfully sailed through the Northwest Passage in both directions. This is clearly not simply an early modern issue, but the genesis of its imaginative lure lies in early modern writing. Many theories have offered possible reasons for the ongoing interest in discovering the Northwest Passage, which fall into three main camps: the glib, that Sebastian Cabot touches off a four-century-long obsession with a suggestion that a northern route was possible (Hakluyt 1600, 6-10); the financial, accessing the great wealth possible in discovering a stable trade route to India and Parliament's various offers of reward (the greatest amount – of 20,000 pounds – coming in 1744); and the artistic, dramatic stories of voyages captured the imagination of a nation to seek adventure.

Each of these theories is contingently plausible. There were voyagers who were interested in Sebastian Cabot's suggestion that "there should be certaine great open places whereby the waters should thus continually passe from the East vnto the West" (Hakluyt 1600, 9), and certainly interest was rekindled with the offers from Parliament, and perhaps, contra W.H. Auden, art does make something happen. But each of these theories shares a common lack as well, the absence of reflexive awareness of their historical contingency; that is, they each neglect or are unable to explain the ongoing interest in discovering the Northwest Passage other than through series of historical accidents.

Cabot's above suggestion that a northwest passage was possible is repeated in many early voyages and tracts, but references to him begin to disappear around the middle of the sixteenth century. The governmental awards would also be a motivational factor, but the parliamentary offers were inconsistent and nothing was ever claimed; the eventual discovery comes many years after the final parliamentary offer was made. The idea of art inspiring action – something that should make the heart of an English student sing – is perhaps the most specious of the three scenarios. Even Hakluyt suggests that there is no need to fulfill this function, the interest in exploration being very active in England. The overwhelming majority of explorers interested in discovery (those who led expeditions like Gilbert and Drake) were hardened explorers, interested in wealth, fame, and (strangely enough) adventure on the sea. The idea of Wordsworthian motivation seems somewhat misplaced here.

While there were many voyages that attempted to cross the Northwest Passage that were clearly interested in the accomplishment for economic ends, the final success of Roald Amundsen comes under much different circumstances. Amundsen attempted the voyage with a smaller ship, specially designed to withstand the polar ice. The voyage was invested in adventure, similar to achieving the summit of Everest, rather than in securing a trade route. Amundsen's voyage demonstrates that the desire to discover the Northwest Passage persisted within and without trade interests, and persisted for many centuries. From the moment of Sebastian Cabot's suggestion above, several centuries pass before there is anything other than mere speculation that the Northwest Passage exists, which begs the question of why so many persisted in the face of overwhelming odds and consistent failure. What was the cause of desire? While it is certain that there was some sort of political will to explore in early modern England, and certain social and economical circumstances in the sixteenth centuries made exploration favourable, I will take up the mantle that Hakluyt himself presents in the second introduction to *Navigations* when he suggests that it is in fact failure that drives the interest to discover. Here again, we are in familiar psychoanalytic territory. And psychoanalysis can construct a path through previous theoretical disjunctions. The interlocking mechanism of all theories and narratives of northwest passage discovery is their shared investment in failure, or, to put it in Lacanese: "there is cause only in something that doesn't work" (Lacan, *Fundamental Concepts* 22).

While many early modern explorers were interested in discovery, it is not at all clear how *Navigations* participates in fuelling the flames of this desire. Of the many narratives describing exploration of the Northwest Passage in *Navigations*, there are two series of voyages that I will consider here: Sebastian and John Cabot's, and Martin Frobisher's. Ramusio's text of Sebasitan Cabot's 1508 voyage (see below) included in *Navigations* is the seminal musing, the provocative 'it could be possible' that inaugurates the chase. The rather tangled textual history surrounding the voyages of Sebastian and John Cabot adds another element of the mystique of the voyage and contributes to the cultivation of desire. Lacan's many discussions of the *Objet petit a* suggest that it is precisely the partial object that creates desire. Limited narrative evidence can potentially create desire, and therefore the various Cabot narratives collected in *Navigations* work well to invoke imaginative interest in discovering the Northwest Passage. Frobisher's voyage shows a deliberate postponement of desire, or perhaps misinforms its readers about the goals of the voyage. The textual issues in these voyages revolve around the editorial move to include some narratives and not others. There is no clear evidence for why Hakluyt includes the narratives that he does, which leads us to a more provocative question of thinking of how the texts that Hakluyt does include signify narratologically.

Each voyager made several attempts, the accounts of which describe various degrees of success or failure. While each was ultimately interested in proving the route existed, the narrative structure of *Navigations* asserts more than this simple repetition. Again, there are moments of narrative duplication that question the stability of narrative while at the same time attempting to prove its validity. Hakluyt does something different with Northwest Passage exploration, presenting a subject heading for a series of narratives:

> THE ENGLISH VOYAGES, NAVIGATIONS, and Discoueries (intended for the finding of a Northwest passage) to the North parts of America, to Meta incognita, and the backeside of Gronland, as farre as 72 degrees and 12 minuts: performed first by Sebastian Cabota, and since by Sir Martin Frobisher, and M. Iohn Davis, with the Patents, Discourses, and Aduertisements thereto belonging. (Hakluyt 1600, 4)

Hakluyt's collection is not an inclusive one, and his introduction details both the thematic importance of the subject matter and also the significant participants in Northwest Passage exploration. Hakluyt does not include the narrative of John Rut's expedition in search of the Northwest Passage of 1527, although he does include a narrative of a 1536 voyage to Newfoundland by Richard Hore. He also omits some narratives from writers who were aboard the voyages that he does include, as I will discuss later. The first document that follows the above announcement is the patent letter from King Henry VII for John Cabot and his sons. This letter is a part of the tangled textual history and questionable sourcing of Sebastian and John Cabot's voyages. Questions surrounding which Cabot was primarily responsible for various exploratory discoveries were not cleared up until recently. Hakluyt reproduces the narratives in their confusing glory, maintaining, if not perpetuating, some misconceptions of early voyages to the new world.

Part of the confusion surrounding John Cabot's voyages comes from the lack of clear manuscript evidence. John Cabot's logbooks are no longer extant, leaving the writing of his children and several maps as the only sources of information about his voyages. While it is certain that scholarship before the 20th century wrongly attributed some of John's discoveries to Sebastian, the question of how complicit Sebastian was in fostering this misconception is less clear. Peter E. Pope in *The Many Landfalls of John Cabot* suggests that Sebastian Cabot did take credit for some of his father's accomplishments but argues he was not an indiscriminate liar. For Pope, Sebastian "lied only when it really mattered" (Pope 66). There are several voyages of discovery to the new world made by someone named Cabot. Three are made consecutively from 1496 to 1498 and then two more in 1508 and 1509. Scholars now agree that John Cabot was the principal explorer for the first three voyages although Sebastian possibly accompanied his father on at least one of his first two voyages (estimates of Sebastian's age put him at fourteen on the first voyage) and the last two voyages were directed by Sebastian (Alan 500-501). John Cabot's adventures to the new world include one abortive voyage made likely in 1496, a successful voyage and return to England in 1497, and a voyage where he most likely disappears in 1498.[14] *Navigations* includes information from several voyages but in an unclear manner. Outside of the patent letter granted by Henry VII in 1496, only one narrative presents a clear date, a voyage of John Cabot in 1497, where John Cabot describes discovering "that land which no man before that time had attempted" (Hakluyt 1600, 6). Hakluyt gets the information from "the map of Sebastian Cabot, cut by Clement

---

[14] Scholarly opinion is mostly in agreement that he is lost at sea, but there are some who have speculated that he does return (Harrisse 449-455, and Quinn, Quinn, and Hill 87-110)

Adams, concerning his discovery of the West Indies, which is to be seene in her majesties privie gallerie at Westminister, and in many other ancient merchants houses" (Hakluyt 1600, 6). The voyage is clearly presented as John Cabot's voyage, even though the source is Sebastian's map. The narrative is short, comprising roughly half a page, briefly noting the land and its inhabitants.

A significant culprit in the confusion is the complete lack of textual evidence. The Clement Adams map, the source for the first voyage of John Cabot, is no longer extant, and most of the documents that describe John's other travels are second hand narratives. This and John Cabot's other voyages are confirmed by Giovanni Baptista Ramusio, Pietro Martire d'Anghierra, Lopez de Gomara, and Martin Frobisher. In each of these cases, there is no extant textual evidence; the writers all refer to either now lost manuscripts or oral sources (Quinn, *Handbook* 371, 431).

Several elements conspire to make distinguishing the two Cabots and their accomplishments more than a little difficult. The *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* suggests that Sebastian was less than eager to quell the misconceived credit he continued to receive for his father's discoveries (Skelton 152-159). This and the absence of any hard textual evidence led scholarship through the 19th century to credit Sebastian for much of what his father John discovered. The discovery of a map in the latter half of the nineteenth century led Henry Harrisse to make corrections just before the turn of the century. Harrisse cleared up misconceptions regarding who discovered what, but maintained that Sebastian was primarily at fault for perpetuating the wrongful discoveries made on the 1497 voyage. More recently, David True has suggested in "Some early maps relating to Florida," that it was Sebastian himself who presented the re-cut map demonstrating John's discoveries in 1497. Hakluyt's own texts endorse this evidence, and True suggests that Sebastian most likely saw some earlier map of John's voyages

> with … errors and misstatements. It was only natural that he would have it

> recut by his erudite young friend Clement Adams. We are not told that this was done and the Clement Adams Map is now lost, but the evidence is fairly clear that the Clement Adams Map became known at the time as the Sebastian Cabot Map, and this name did not refer to any map drawn by either John or Sebastian Cabot, nor did it refer to the 1544 Paris Map. (True 1954, 77)

True argues that because the exploits of John Cabot were so well known, appropriating the credit for them would be nearly impossible. Hakluyt's introduction agrees, suggesting that the map hung in "many ancient merchants houses" (Hakluyt 1598, 6).

Intentionally or not, Hakluyt is not free from misdirection. Hakluyt's history of these voyages has no clear chronology and comes from several different sources. Other than the map suggested above, there are no extant materials from any of John Cabot's voyages. As mentioned above, any evidence regarding his explorations of the coast of North America comes from secondary sources. There are a few strange references from Sebastian, however. In the third volume of *Navigations* there is a heading that suggests the narrative is "A discourse of Sebastian Cabot touching his discovery of part of the West India out of England in the time of King Henry the seventh" (Hakluyt 1600, 6). Again, the source is not first hand; the narrative comes from Galeacius Butrigarius, the Pope's legate in Spain. While this text could be a recollection of the 1497 voyage piloted by John Cabot, the narrator is not John. The initial paragraph appears to be a standard laudatory introduction, but sings the praises of Sebastian rather than John. The second paragraph then shifts from third person perspective to first, where Sebastian recalls a 1496 voyage that reaches Newfoundland and travells up the coast in search of a western passage. Proceeding as far north as 56 degrees latitude, Sebastian despairs when he discovers the land "turning east" (Hakluyt 1600, 6) and ventures south again as far as Florida. Finally, with his resources failing, he returns to England. There is little critical stock to be placed in the narrative as it stands. Scholars as far back as Richard Eden have questioned the validity of this account, suggesting that Sebastian would have been far too young to be at the helm of a ship, much less in control of the entire fleet (according to the narrative in *Navigations* there are only two ships in the fleet). Eden suggests that Sebastian came to England in 1484 when he was four years old, and would therefore have been 16 at the time of the above voyage. Adding slightly to the confusion is the fact that the exact age of Sebastian Cabot is not known. Even resources like the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* reflect scholarly disagreement. In the entry for John Cabot, David B. Quinn suggests that Sebastian was "about twelve" (*Oxford Dictionary of Biography Online*) years old in 1497, but in the entry for Sebastian Cabot, David Loades states that Sebastian was born in 1481, which would make him sixteen in 1497. Neither of these scholars is able to present a definitive age for Sebastian, but their relative disagreement shows just how difficult even speculation is.

This narrative of a voyage in 1496 could accurately describe Cabot's voyage, but certainly only if John Cabot were leading the expedition, and the earliest it could have taken place is 1497. More confusing is the inclusion of a second narrative. This time the source is Italian politician and cosmographer Giovanni Battista Ramusio (Hakluyt uses Ramusio several times as an authority on various cosmographical issues along with Pietro Martire d'Anghiera and Francisco Lopez de Gomara). There are no dates given, but Ramusio states that Sebastian sails as far north as 67 ½ degrees looking for the Northwest Passage and "would have done it, if the mutinie of the shipmaster and Mariners had not hindered him and made him return homewards from that place" (Hakluyt 1600, 7-8). The substance of this narrative also sounds much like the voyage made by Sebastian Cabot in 1508. Peter Pope has stated,

> there is good evidence that Sebastian Cabot commanded an expedition up the coast of Labrador in 1508. Peter Martyr described Sebastian's explorations in

> several early sixteenth-century editions of his *Decades* and the voyage was recalled, later in the century, by George Best, in his account of the 1576 expedition of Sir Martin Frobisher, the English explorer first known to have followed Sebastian to these northern waters. The younger Cabot often claimed to have explored as far north as 55 degrees, and he told Ramusio that he reached 67 1/2 degrees north, finding open water in what we now call the Hudson strait. (Pope 49)

Hakluyt includes a text from Martire and Ramusio and reprints the discrepancy Pope suggests. In spite of this discrepancy, it is possible that the two accounts describe the same voyage. Ramusio's text comes from an interview with Sebastian, and it seems that Sebastian is at the very least confusing some details. Ramusio suggests that Cabot

> directed his course so farre towards the North pole, that euen in the moneth of Iuly he found monstrous heapes of ice swimming on the sea, and in maner continuall day light, yet saw he the land in that tract free from ice, which had bene molten by the heat of the Sunne. Thus seeing such heapes of yce before him, hee was enforced to turne his sailes and follow the West. (Hakluyt 1600, 8)

In spite of the initial danger expressed, the text quickly recovers the possibility of the Northwest Passage suggesting, as stated above, that, "there should be certaine great open places whereby the waters should thus continually passe from the East vnto the West" (Hakluyt 1600, 9). At this point, Hakluyt includes several more narratives of voyages to the northwest, all from foreign sources. Hakluyt excerpts a section from the fourth book of Francis Lopez de Gomara's *General History of the West Indies,* and finally a section from Robert Fabian's "Chronicle not hitherto printed" (Hakluyt 1600, 9). In each of these texts the narratives are vague and no dates for the voyages are given. The sections included describe discoveries and latitudes travelled, something either Cabot could have accomplished, but the far north voyage to 67 ½ degrees is most likley Sebastian. The only text that tips its hand is Ramusio's mentioned above.

This rather tangled narrative history that has kept the attention of scholars for many years now seems on the decline. There is still scholarly interest in John and Sebastian Cabot, but the textual history is, in the minds of most scholars, either sufficiently resolved or beyond speculation. It is clear that many different sources and the absence of any manuscript from John Cabot created a context that made a clear assessment of the events of John Cabot's voyages extremely difficult. Hakluyt plays a small role in the confusion, re-printing the text from the Clement Adams map with Sebastian's commentary. Peter Pope's more recent work suggests that because Sebastian is guilty of taking credit for some of his father's accomplishments that he "is not believed even when he probably should be" (Pope 66). Pope makes no mention of Galeacius Butrigarius' narrative, but suggests that the accounts included in *Navigations* "confused the son's 1508 voyage to northern Labrador with the father's 1497 voyage in the middle latitudes" (Pope 45).

So, what contemporary interest is there in a patched and often inaccurate collection of narratives? The very fact that there is so much missing is fuel for scholarly interest; there are many theories about who the authors of the individual texts are. Scholars have also speculated about how Sebastian came to get credit for John's discoveries and who participated in the deception. The textual corpus is limited – the entire Cabot canon included in *Navigations* spans only 15 pages – which allows for broader speculation. While these texts all share a central failure, the inability to discover the Northwest Passage, it is the nature and structure of the failure that proves to be an impetus for further voyages. A perspective generated from John Cabot's voyages as printed in *Navigations* shows that the search for the Northwest Passage looks like an incomplete puzzle rather than a navigational impossibility, a puzzle that enterprising voyagers could assemble for significant financial gains. The initial architects of the puzzle, John and Sebastian Cabot, are at best half-hearted designers. The information we have does not tell of a desperate attempt to discover the Northwest Passage; in fact there is no significant desire for this discovery in the narrative at all. The desire inculcated from these narratives does not arise from some positive content, but rather is the result of this very lack.

A good example of reconfiguring the lack as impetus for the discovery of the Northwest Passage comes in Robert Thornes's text to Henry VIII encouraging him to explore the north. Thorne trots out a well-worn argument, that the discovery of the Northwest Passage will bring glory to the empire, and emphasizes that England is in a particularly favorable geographical space to explore this new, fourth section of the globe. He is also describes at great length the potential riches waiting to be exploited in the new world. His reasoning regarding navigation is rather interesting, however. Where Cabot describes the seas filled with ice in July, in spite of perpetual sunshine, as a significant impediment, Thorne turns this to a navigational advantage:

> And now to declare something of the commodity and vtilitie of this Nauigation and discouerie: it is very cleere and certaine, that the Seas that commonly men say, without great danger, difficulty and perill, yea rather it is impossible to passe, that those same Seas be nauigable and without anie such danger, but that shippes may passe and haue in them perpetuall clerenesse of the day without any darkenesse of the night: which thing is a great commoditie for the nauigants. (Hakluyt 1598, 213)

What could be easier than traversing seas in constant daylight? Thorne does acknowledge the potential danger of the northern climate and ice, but downplays it suggesting that previous historical authority claimed the Equator to be impassable and uninhabitable, something experience had since proven false (Hakluyt 1598, 219).

Before moving on to tackle the narratives of Davis and Frobisher, the situation of discovery as left by Cabot requires a little more clarification. The arrangement of the narratives in *Navigations* shows a desire for stronger evidence of the possibility of a Northwest Passage. There are two theoretical defences of such a possibility that fall between the Cabot narratives and Frobisher's and Davis's narratives, one from Sir Humphrey Gilbert and the other from Richard Willes. Gilbert, the half brother to Sir Walter Ralegh, wrote *A Discourse of a Discoverie for a new Passage to Cataia* (which Hakluyt reprints in *Navigations* 1600, 11– 24), and later was given letters patent for the "planting" of an English colony in America. Willes is a precursor to Hakluyt and is Richard Eden's successor. He reprints an edition of Pietro Martire d'Anghiera's *Decades of the New World* under the title of *The History of Travayle in the West and East Indies, and other countries lying either way towards the fruitfull and ryche Moluccaes . . . with a discourse of the North-west Passage* in 1577. As mentioned earlier, Richard Eden prints a translation of *De Orbe Novo Decades* in 1555. Willes expands Eden's translation of Anghierra's *Decades*, including abridged versions of decades five through eight, absent in the 1555 edition. Hakluyt includes Willes' essay on the possibility of the Northwest Passage. Both narratives use ancient philosophy and first-hand accounts of new world discovery to prove that America is an island, deploying reasoning that runs from the logical to the ridiculous (Hakluyt 1600, 27). Each writer reaches back to classical authority, finding the idea of the Northwest Passage "confirmed by Plato, Aristotle, and other ancient phylosophers" (Hakluyt 1600, 11) and "all the best modern geographers, as Gemma Frisius, Munsterus, Appianus, Hunterus, Gastaldus, Guyccardinus, Michael Tramasinus, Francis Demongenitus, Bernardus Puteanus, Andreas Vivasor, Tramontanus, Petrus Martyr, and also Ortelius, who doth coast out in his generall Mappe set out Anno 1569" (Hakluyt 1600, 13).

In an attempt to cover all the bases Gilbert divides his narrative into ten chapters. Gilbert structures the first four chapters of his argument according to the substance of the evidence and argumentation, suggesting in his "Capitulo's" that he will prove the existence of a northwest passage through "authoritie," "Reason," "experience," and "circumstance" (Hakluyt 1600, 11). Gilbert knows that the argument is speculative, suggesting often that he finds his 'belief' confirmed by various bodies of evidence (Hakluyt 1600, 12). None of these methods leads to definitive evidence for the existence of the Northwest Passage, but the mountain of evidence makes a convincing circumstantial case. In chapter four of his book he discusses how circumstances lead him to believe in a northwest passage to India:

> THe diuersitie betweene bruite beastes and men, or betweene the wise and the simple is, that the one iudgeth by sense onely, and gathereth no surety of any thing that he hath not seene, felt, heard, tasted, or smelled: And the other not so onely, but also findeth the certaintie of things by reason, before they happen to be tryed. Wherefore I haue added proofes of both sorts, that the one and the other might thereby be satisfied. (Hakluyt 1600, 16)

The above citation broadens *Navigations*' thematic concerns, and could easily stand in as a mission statement for the book as a whole. Gilbert endorses both theoretical and empirical methods of determination. The fact that he feels such a statement is necessary shows a familiarity with a tug of war dispute in the sixteenth century between empirical and theoretical methods of phenomenology. There is a bit of a hierarchy here, where the wise man is able to look beyond the empirical to reason, conversely making empiricism the formative of the two. The move to rationalism is, of course, necessary because of the lack of any hard evidence of a northwest passage. Rationalism's logical effect is to produce a leap of faith, belief in the possibility of a northwst passage, and create financial support for an attempt at discovery.

After the leap of faith left by theoretical intervention, narratives from Martin Frobisher and John Davis follow. Frobisher's three voyages follow successively from 1576 to 1578, and the two versions of events are separated by two additional texts, one from Thomas Wiars who provides information about an island discovered on the third voyage, and "notes framed by M. Richard Hakluyt of the middle temple Esquire, given to a certaine Gentleman that went with M. Frobisher in his Northwest discoverie, for their directions" (Hakluyt 1600, 45). The first series of texts has a different writer for each voyage. The first account comes from Christopher Hall in 1576, the second from Dionise Settle in 1577, and the third from Thomas Ellis in 1578. The second set of narratives is written entirely by George Best. Although there is no clear evidence from *Navigations* that Best was along for the first voyage, he was Frobisher's second in command for the second voyage and became the captain of the *Anne Francis* on the final voyage. In *A True discourse of the late voyages of discoverie for finding a passage to Cataya, by North-West, under the conduct of Martin Frobisher, General,* published in 1578, Best does include texts for all three voyages. Hakluyt for his part reprints multiple texts for each voyage and changes some elements of those he includes (he for instance omits Best's introduction).

The differences between the two series of texts begin with their respective lengths. The three texts from Best are roughly four times longer than the accumulated texts from Hall, Settle, and Ellis. Best's work shows evidence of particular editorial choice, as many of the latitudes, declinations, distances, and bearings are left blank. Best's text was published in late 1578, after the privy council instructed Frobisher and the other captains to turn over their written accounts to the council and issued a publication ban on any further information regarding the new world. The three texts that precede Best's series are written in a much more straightforward manner, the writers most often preoccupied with technical detail. Christopher Hall's text is especially full of nautical detail, carefully cataloguing declinations, wind direction, and descriptions of the land. The difference in the two series of texts is as much about the conventions of style as it is about a concern for verisimilitude. The narratives from Hall, Settle, and Ellis read much like narratives such as Jenkinson's. Each of the first three narratives presents a consistent chronological text with technical detail regarding distances and navigational discoveries. Best's account is a much more compelling narrative, particularly because he is interested in telling an interesting and provocative story where the other three are interested in information only. Where the first three writers present texts in something of a 'homely stile,' George Best is dedicated, like Michael, to avoiding a 'common' narrative. Best is clearly the most capable writer of the four, and he delights in dramatising the myriad dangers each respective crew faced. Best sometimes overdoes it, extravagantly describing certain places and events, and is also not above injecting a little extraneous information to spice up an otherwise dull section of the voyage. The other three writers are just the opposite, relaying events with boring consistency, often presenting incredible hardships almost as everyday occurrences.

There is a latent indication in both sets of texts that discovery of the Northwest Passage is not a primary concern, or at least this interest is increasingly downgraded. Most of the texts in the first series are interested in describing the landscape and various attributes of the native inhabitants. Although the term is anachronistic, these follow a standard ethnological tack, describing the appearance, technology, and religion of the people while investigating the land for things to extract or areas of possible cultivation. And while each voyage is supposedly mandated to establish peaceful interaction with the natives, it is rare to find a narrative that does not describe some sort of clash between indigenous peoples and the English. On the first voyage several of Frobisher's men are lured to land by seemingly friendly natives only to be taken captive. The men are never seen again but both Settle and Ellis describe Frobisher as a concerned captain, spending time attempting to find out their fate and possibilities for their recovery. Best describes the capture of the five men on the first voyage, but makes no mention of any future effort to recover them. There is also very little in either set of texts dedicated to exploration. Here another not so subtle difference appears between Best's and the earlier three narratives. While Hall, Settle, and Ellis each claim discovery of a 'passage to Cathay' as the main objective of the voyage, Best suggests in the title of the second and third narratives that the voyages are "pretended for the discovery of a new passage to Cataya" (Hakluyt 1600, 60).[15] The side note in Best's description of the first voyage also foreshadows the goals of the future voyages stating, "In the second voyage commission was given onely for the bringing of ore" (Hakluyt 1600, 60). This at the very least suggests a kind of ulterior motive for the second and third voyages. Best's assessment turns out to be the most accurate, as all accounts of the last two voyages show that Frobisher has all but abandoned any real attempt to discover a northwest passage.

Best's texts also include significant details that are only vaguely referred to in the other three. Best tells of the discovery of gold in Frobisher's Strait, and implies that gold excavation is the goal of the next two voyages. This is, of course, a famous blunder, as the rock excavated from Baffin Island contains nothing of value, an embarrassment to all involved with the voyage including the queen. Best's first narrative suggests that:

> After his [Frobisher's] arriuall in London, being demanded of sundry his friends what thing he had brought them home out of that countrey, he had nothing left to present them withall but a piece of this blacke stone. And it fortuned a gentlewoman one of the aduenturers wiues to haue a piece

---

[15] George Best does edit his texts upon return to England, so it is possible that the second voyage maintained an interest in the discovery of the Northwest Passage.

> therof, which by chance she threw and burned in the fire, so long, that at the length being taken forth, and quenched in a litle vineger, it glistered with a bright marquesset of golde. Whereupon the matter being called in some question, it was brought to certaine Goldfiners in London to make assay thereof, who gaue out that it held golde, and that very richly for the quantity. (Hakluyt 1600, 59–60)

Contemporary scholarship suggests that the above account is accurate in spirit but not in its details. James McDermott, in *The Third Voyage of Martin Frobisher, 1578*, writes of how the Queen's directives and dubious chances of financial success "required initial plans to be scale[d] downwards" (McDermott 6). Certainly the possibility of gold in the new world was a motivating factor, but mostly to those already interested in the voyage. The haul from the first voyage to the new world was meagre to say the least, consisting of one Inuit man and a few token rocks. McDermott points out that "Frobisher, apparently fulfilling an earlier promise, gave this [rock] to [Michael] Lok as a memento, the first object discovered in the new land" (McDermott, 4), and it was Lok who investigated and largely trumped up its value. Assuming that the 'glister' in the rock was evidence of gold, Lok sent the rock to various experts for appraisal. While several appraisers suggested that the rock was indeed worthless, one expert, Jean Baptiste Agnello, claimed that the sample contained both silver and gold (McDermott, 4–8). This assessment led to a series of failed deceptions on the part of Lok and Agnello. As the chief organizer of the voyages, Michael Lok bore the brunt of the reprisals. With questions swirling about the honesty of Lok's business dealings, suits from his creditors soon arose, and the once wealthy Lok was reduced to penury because of his obsession for new world discovery. There is no question that the last two narratives, in spite of the fact that each claims to be looking for "a new passage to Cataya, China, and the East India, by the Northwest," are primarily concerned with excavating the supposed gold brought back from previous voyages. The overwhelming desire to find gold made the third voyage completely about extraction. The fleet ballooned to fifteen ships and carried with it a mandate for extraction and sophisticated mining equipment. The texts also demonstrated no attempt to discover the Northwest Passage, and show that Frobisher and men with his fleet were absorbed with acquiring as much ore as possible.

The narratives of the second and third voyages differ in desire more than content. McDermott suggests that the last two voyages had a double purpose, of extraction and exploration. On the second voyage,

> all three vessels were to load ore in the new land, unless it was clearly proved to be worthless on sight (a highly unlikely eventuality, given the current expectations of the ore and the profound technical shortcomings of the small furnaces carried by the expedition). Should this be the case the *Ayde* was to return to England immediately, whilst Frobisher would take the *Gabriel* and *Michael*, having loaded extra victuals from the *Ayde*, to press on westwards, force the passage and sail on to Cathay. (McDermott 6)

The latter half of this mandate was never seriously undertaken, and all three ships returned to England after filling 160 tons of worthless rock into the *Ayde*. The accounts from Best and Settle show two sides to this narrative coin. Best's text makes clear that excavation was an important part of the voyage while Settle carries on with the sham of attempted exploration. Best tells how, on the 19th of July 1577, Frobisher, his "goldfiners with him, attempted to goe on shore with a small rowing Pinnesse, upon the small Ilande where the Ore was taken up" (Hakluyt 1600, 63). This sort of expedition happens several times, all with some success, to the point where Best declares the exploration element of the voyage dead:

> But he not contented with the matter he sought for, and well considering the short time he had in hand, and the greedie desire our countrey hath to a present sauour and returne of gaine, bent his whole indeuour only to find a Mine to fraight his ships, and to leaue the rest (by Gods helpe) hereafter to be well accomplished. (Hakluyt 1600, 65)

This abandonment of purpose, and the discussion of the discovery of 'value' in the new world, is handled very differently by the first three writers. There is no mention of the London scene in Hall's account, which stands to reason as he functioned as the narrator for the voyage and the event Best describes happened after arriving back in England. Settle's account of the 1577 voyage presents the discoveries in a much more vague way. Upon reaching the new world, Settle writes: "The day following, being the 19 of Julie, our captaine returned to the ship, with report of supposed riches, which shewed it self in the bowels of those barren mountaines, wherewith wee were all satisfied" (Hakluyt 1600, 34). Settle makes no mention of the 'goldfiners' that, according to Best, accompany Frobisher on this venture. There is also no clear explanation of what the 'supposed riches' are. The letters patent for the voyages describe value in broad terms, from natural commodities to potential markets, making this description of value rather speculative.

The texts that describe the departure from the new world on Frobisher's second voyage illustrate the stylistic variance between the two writers. Dionise Settle describes the departure with a brevity of style typical of the other two writers:

> The 24. of August, after we had satisfied our minds with fraight sufficient for our vessels, though not our couetous desires with such knowledge of the Countrey, people, and other commodities as are before rehearsed, we

> departed therehence. The 17. of September we fell with the lands end of *England,* and so sailed to Milford Hauen, from whence our Generall rode to the Court for order, to what Port or Hauen to conduct the ship. (Hakluyt 1600, 39)

The phrase 'commodities. . . before rehearsed' refers to Hakluyt's instructions to the voyagers and subtly signals a shift in the direction of the voyage from exploration in the first voyage to extraction of what they presume is gold in the third. The reference to the desires of the crew shows that there is still an interest in exploration and discovery that goes unsatisfied. The mercantile interests are at the forefront of the voyage, but there is still a gesture toward the breadth of possibility of discovery, and an added impetus for future voyages should the store of gold eventually be exhausted. Settle's straightforward account of the departure stands in contrast to Best's rather flowery description of the same event:

> Now our worke growing to an end, and hauing, onely with fiue poore Miners, and the helpe of a few gentlemen and souldiers, brought aboord almost two hundreth unne of Ore in the space of twenty dayes, euery man there withall well comforted, determined lustely to worke a fresh for a bone voyage, to bring our labour to a speedy and happy ende.
>
> And vpon Wedesday at night being the one and twentieth of August, we fully finished the whole worke. And it was now good time to leaue, for as the men were well wearied, so their shooes and clothes were well worne, their baskets bottoms orne out, their tooles broken, and the ships reasonably well filled. Some with ouer-straining themselues receiued hurts

> not a little dangerous, some hauing their bellies broken, and others their legs made lame. And about this time the yce began to congeale and freeze about our ships sides a night, which gaue vs a good argument of the Sunnes declining Southward, & put vs in mind to make more haste homeward. (Hakluyt 1600, 72)

Best is certainly invested in rhetoric in a way Settle is not, as his description of the mental and physical state of the voyagers shows. In the excerpt quoted above, Best has yet to get on with the business of actually describing the voyage home, a several page explanation for Best that takes Settle only one sentence. The framing is not the only difference, however, as the circumstances of departure are much different in the two texts. Settle's account suggests that it is the fulfilment of their mandate that calls them home, an attention to duty that checks desire. Best agrees saying that the men had finished "the whole worke" but also says that the circumstances of the crew and significant natural impediments made it impossible for them to stay any longer. The workers are near the end of their rope, their equipment failing, and literally falling out of their clothes, incapable of pursuing their mandate further. With the coming of winter and dangerous ice floes on the way, the crew have no choice but to leave. Best also describes the ships as "reasonably well filled," not nearly the confident "fraight sufficient to our vessels" of Settle's account. The ore that Frobisher brings back on this and his third voyage eventually turns out to be worthless, but early assumptions of its value would motivate interest and eventually provide one other voyage to Frobisher's Strait on Baffin Island.

The presentation of the final voyage highlights some interesting problems. The first voyage contains one eyewitness account and one contrived account. While three ships set out on the voyage initially, only the *Ayde* actually gets to North America. During a storm the small pinnace sinks and the *Michael*, in what some have called an act of mutiny, decides the trip is too dangerous and heads back to England. Interestingly, this bit of information comes from Best's narrative, not from the eyewitness account. On the second voyage, three ships set out from England. Once again the *Michael* loses its way and returns to England before the others. In this case, *Navigations* presents all the narratives possible, one from Best, who is aboard the *Ayde* with Frobisher, and another from Dionise Settle. The third voyage, however, presents a new problem for Hakluyt. The third voyage consists of fifteen ships, and while the *Michael* and the *Judith* do get separated from the main group, there are several narratives of the third voyage that do not make it into *Navigations*. This voyage presents the opposite problem to the first, where a surfeit of narratives requires an editorial choice.

The two narratives of the third voyage (and the supplemental note from Thomas Wiars) adhere to most of the critical assertions made earlier of the first two voyages. Best's narrative is much longer than Ellis', and Best is certainly the superior writer. On the third voyage Hakluyt does not include narratives from a number of sources. Charles Jackman's fragmented journal, Edward Fenton's ship's log and journal for the *Judith*, and the notary Edward Selman's narrative are all missing from *Navigations* (they are all edited in McDermott 2001). The question of why Hakluyt includes the two narratives he does, amid what appears to be a wealth of textual possibilities, is a perplexing one. Certainly Ellis is the weakest writer of the bunch – not a single commentary on Frobisher's third voyage passes up the opportunity to point this out – and he appears to have fabricated certain elements of the voyage. Ellis describes several encounters with the Inuit – on "Countess of Sussex Island" and "Beares sounde" and others – that appear exclusively in his text. This would not be so surprising if it were not for the fact that an opportunity to write about encounters with the natives was rarely missed. Best especially is fascinated by the Inuit, describing encounters in great detail and often making specious claims to their origin. It is unlikely that all of the other writers in the fleet would overlook these encounters had they happened.

There are some obvious reasons for including Best's text within *Navigations*, but its inclusion proposes some problems as well. There are elements within both series of texts that Hakluyt edits out, but Best's texts provide more than a more aesthetically pleasing and accessible version of Frobisher's three voyages. *Navigations* includes print only. Any drawing or map referenced in the text is omitted in Hakluyt but present in Best's *True Discourse* published by Henry Bynnyman in 1578. From the instructions to Frobisher's voyage, it is likely that at least on the third voyage, drawings of the landscape would have returned with the fleet. Thomas Ellis, for instance, suggests that he should bring back drawings of the ice floes the fleet encounters. Hakluyt also does not include any cartographical representation in any part of *Navigations*, in spite of frequent references to the use of maps and charts in all the narratives. Hakluyt also edits some of Best's texts, removing most often what seems like irrelevant material. Best includes a list of orders given by Martin Frobisher, which are for some reason omitted in *Navigations* (Best 34-36), and there are a few moments where Hakluyt adds some marginal commentary (McDermott 205 n1, 216). Hakluyt also removes Best's concluding remarks. Other than the obvious aesthetic richness that Best's text adds to *Navigations*, Best's interests in the new world often support Hakluyt's own. Both Hakluyt and Best were interested in developing the new world agriculturally, with Best perhaps the more optimistic of the two. As the fleet is ready to depart the mining camp, Best makes a suggestion of the potential value of the new world that shows Hakluyt's influence: "We Buryed the timber of our pretended fort. Also here we sowed pease, corne, and other graine, to prove the fruitfulnesse of the soyle against the next yeere" (Hakluyt 1600, 91). Best's interest in finding out the fertility of the land certainly is in league with Hakluyt's own agricultural interests, but Best's practice leaves a lot to chance. The possibility of sustainable development increased the possibility of colonization and increased the possibility of future voyages, but it is unlikely that Hakluyt would endorse such loose farming practices. Planting crops without properly tending to the fields runs contrary to Hakluyt's grand scheme for colonization fuelled through agricultural development as outlined in his *Discourse of Western Planting*. The lackadaisical farming technique that Best endorses reflects his interest in ore rather than agriculture. He is concerned more with creating a sustainable mining camp, developing agriculture to support the business of extracting ore, as his assessment of value suggests: "we filled our ships with many barrels of meale, pease, griste, and sundrie other good things, which was of the provision of those whych should inhabite, if occasion served. And insteede therof we fraighted our ships full of Ore, whiche we holde of farre greater price" (Hakluyt 1600, 91). There is a concern about food, but it takes a back seat to the potential value of ore, which shows a much quicker short-term return. Hakluyt, on the other hand, would rather see a concerted effort to cultivate agricultural wealth in the new world, but creating a stable mining camp would be a good start.

Between the two versions of the three separate voyages there are numerous moments where the narratives disagree, but the exclusion of many sources and the absence of a final, definitive account problematizes any theory that *Navigations* desires clear objective knowledge. Contemporary scholarship generally follows the latter protocol, searching out as many sources as possible to construct a definitive account, pointing out the inaccuracies of each narrative along the way. The Hakluyt Society has recently published James McDermott's recent study *The Third Voyage of Martin Frobisher* that does precisely that. McDermott includes an edited facsimile of all extant texts, and produces a critical narrative of the voyage from it, not unlike what Hakluyt asks travellers to do aboard each ship (see chapter 1). It seems likely that Hakluyt knew of other extant texts, and there is no evidence that Hakluyt even attempted to track down any of the texts of Frobisher's third voyage not included in *Navigations*.

The two series of texts work similarly to the double texts of Jenkinson's voyages to Russia mentioned earlier. Moments where the text gestures to outside sources highlight the provisionality of the individual texts. From the first set of texts describing Frobisher's voyages, Dionise Settle assumes that the reader has read Hall's text of the first voyage, and draws attention to the shortcomings of his text:

> I Could declare vnto the Readers, the latitude and longitude of such places and regions as we haue bene at, but not altogether so perfectly as our masters and others, with many circumstances of tempests and other accidents incident to Sea faring men, which seeme not altogether strange, but I let them passe to their reports as men most apt to set forth and declare the same. I haue also left the names of the Countreys on both the shores vntouched, for lacke of vnderstanding the peoples language: as also for sundry respects, not needfull as yet to be declared. (Hakluyt 1600, 39)

The gesture to other sources points forward as much as it does backward; Settle shows the limitations of individual texts and the limitations of individual perspective. It's not that he cannot describe the longitude and latitude of the places he visits, but that others have done it capably. He also signals the narrative limits of his text, that he does not include all of the dangers that his crew actually faced. Settle's text acknowledges the debt of previous narratives, and his own personal limitations as writer. What Settle's text lacks in style is made up by Best, and what Best's text lacks in substance is made up by Christopher Hall.

Frobisher himself did not keep a journal of any of his voyages; the only other first hand account of the 1577 voyage came from Best. And while Best's narrative is close to definitive – even McDermott's 2001 text relies on Best most heavily – it is not absolute. There are elements in Ellis' text, real or imagined, and the others that are absent in Best. More importantly, Best's text gestures to its own contingency. He makes it clear that the notary for the voyage is Master Selman who is charged with recording several official moments: moments that are excluded from *Navigations* and Best's account. If a whole picture of the voyage is to be had, it needs multiple narratives for it to be complete.

But there is a question of whether this whole picture is possible or even desirable. Again, the absence of a totalizing narrative inherently undermines this conclusion, and Hakluyt's very project opposes it. Past the notion of contingency, repetition – unlike the earlier discussion of the voyages to Russia – presents the inevitability of repression. Searching each narrative for the truth of desire, the very definition of Lacanian truth, scholars have found numerous moments of repression, for example, Best's assertion that he and admiral Frobisher get separated when other accounts relay something closer to desertion or mutiny. The ethical implications of keeping open desire shows itself in a concrete way here as well. The failure to understand the language of the natives opens an odd moment of respect for the culture already there. This respect is a fidelity to lacunae, which leaves open the need for future expeditions and texts.

While the differences between the three narratives point to the subjective nature of historical tradition, the commonalities also clear a path for revealing the desire of the voyagers themselves. There are certain elements that consistently run through each narrative, with perhaps a subtle change in degree. On the first voyage, both Best and Hall relay how Frobisher pulls back from further exploration into the Northwest Passage when he certainly could have explored further. After the mutiny of the *Michael* Frobisher explores "no more than ten miles from the head of what would become known as Frobisher Bay" (McDermott 3). With only thirteen remaining sailors it was indeed impractical to press on all the way to 'Cathay,' but he could

> have sailed on for a few days more, to definitively prove or disprove the passage; but Frobisher seems to have weighed the chances of securing backing for a further expedition if he returned to England to report outright failure, and decided to leave open the question of its existence in that location. (McDermott 4)

What is this if not a moment of conscious repression? Here Frobisher does not attempt to definitively prove or disprove the passage and therefore he is able to perpetuate his desire.

The dissolution of desire is in fact the closing of the narrative. Each narrative presented demonstrates a history governed by an ideological edifice that precedes experience. Even if the principles of historical writing became uniform, it is clear that individual perspectives differ. At the end of these three narratives we can see something of the symphony of narrative that arises from *Navigations*, and how each cluster of repeated texts renders specifically different narrative positions.

Chapter IV

The Shifting Space of the Text: The Shifting Pace of the Academy

In the past three chapters I have called into question Hakluyt's claim that he does not alter any of the texts he collects. It is clear that Hakluyt did make changes to many of the texts he collected, and excerpted and excised others that he included in *Navigations*. Scholars like Richard Collinson, Edward Delmar Morgan, and Charles Henry Coote have compared Hakluyt's texts against other extant printed accounts, pointing out moments of discrepancy. These do not always definitively show that it is Hakluyt who changes the text. Within the Frobisher series of texts, Hakluyt's version often differs from all other extant texts and manuscripts, which suggests that Hakluyt either changed words without noting it, or worked from a now lost manuscript. Indeed, any absolute picture of Hakluyt's practices is impossible to construct precisely because many of the texts he used were destroyed in the printing process (Payne, "travel books of Richard Hakluyt" 23 and below 160). There are numerous occasions where the text in *Navigations* is the only extant copy of a particular narrative. Most of what we have regarding the Cabot voyages, except for the letter to John Day, is found only in *Navigations*. Keeping in mind that Hakluyt certainly did change many of the texts he collected, the object of this chapter is not to expose Hakluyt as a charlatan, nor is it to validate his actions as an editor. The questions that have been lurking behind the previous three chapters are: what is at stake in making this editorial claim, and what sort of text emerges from even a tacit acceptance of this program? What effect does such a practice have on the compilation of a historical text like *Navigations*? At the very least, keeping up the appearance of non-interference as

Hakluyt does leads to a text consisting of multiple forms. This multiplicity is demonstrated in the variance in formal structure, genre, and style of *Navigations*. It is also reflected in the varied aesthetic quality of different narratives in *Navigations* and extends to the evidentiary practices (direct experience or theoretical and textual expertise) and the ways in which certain conventions of textuality are deployed. Marginal glosses, for instance, appear in many different ways and accomplish different things in *Navigations*. As far as I have found, no study has yet investigated the marginalia in *Navigations*, and I have not found a discussion of *Navigations* from the perspective of the history of the book. This chapter will place *Navigations* within book history theory, investigating the material affect of the text on the reader and speculating about how the reader in turn regulates the text.

Scholarship of the Text

Although textual scholarship is catching fire in the academy, the tenor of some recent articles belies its status as critical vogue. Studies in early modern marginalia distinguish between manuscript marginalia and the marginalia in printed books. The study of handwritten annotations generally investigates the reader's interaction with the text. Handwritten glosses give insight into reading practices that change with various historical and social contexts. Studies into printed marginalia focus on the editorial participation in the text, investigating how the marginal notes direct, construct, and contextualize reading practices. With the marginalia in printed books, scholarship often follows two lines of inquiry. There is a clear and obvious interest in theorizing the relationship between the marginal gloss and the main text, but because the author of the main text often does not write the marginalia, significant effort has been dedicated to discovering the identity of the marginal writer. Presumably the discovery of the author and his or her personal philosophical or political positioning would give insight into the effect of the gloss itself. The critical work of divining authorial intention seems rather out of date, but the work of D.F. McKenzie has certainly fuelled this dimension of the study of marginalia. D.F. McKenzie's intervention in the mid 1980's asked the academy to re-evaluate Wimsatt's and Beardsley's intentional fallacy argument, suggesting that all elements of the text are fodder for interpretation, including bindings and epigraphs. More recent studies of marginalia have taken issue with the authorial interest, suggesting that this sort of study has not gone away: in fact, interest in it has increased (Sauer 3).

Interest in the structural position of the gloss has led to an interest in the diachronic movement of the gloss from marginal note, to footnote, to endnote (Lipking 632). Similar analyses have investigated the shifting place of the text, how early modern texts have piled up marginal commentary over the centuries (Sleights *Managing Readers* and Marcus). All of these critical concerns have contributed to a now rich field of textual study, where no aspect of the book lies outside the scope of criticism. When Jerome McGann suggests that a text is not a static thing but "a series of specific acts of production" (McGann, 4), he argues that through the complex network of authorship, printing, editing, translating, publishing and republishing, all texts are inherently comprised of multiple significatory elements. Using as case studies *The Final Collected Poems of W.B. Yeats* and a corrected text of William Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!*, McGann shows that authorial intentions – or a sense of what works – changes, and therefore "the author's final intentions cannot be used to determine copy text" (McGann 62). From the previous three chapters it is easy to see that *Navigations* certainly qualifies as a hybrid text, and that often multiple voices and concerns are at play within the book. Though McGann takes a dim view of the search for authorial intention, his scholarship is indicative of the kind of hybrid analysis working within textual or bibliographic study. The scholarship that has grown out of this has worked alongside theoretical practices to cast the reader as an active builder of the text rather than a passive receiver of information. There is no lack of theoretical analyses of the reader's participation in book construction. Critics as diverse as Stanley Fish, Jacques Derrida, and Jacques Lacan (Lacan, *Ecrits* 412- 444) have investigated the position of reader as creator of meaning. From the more material point of view, the early modern period furnishes the contemporary bibliographer with a rich field of study, since many material elements of texts were commissioned by the reader (like many book bindings) rather than publisher or author.

The new interest in marginalia in early modern texts has followed on the heels of the re-vamped critical program of bibliographical study. By taking into account the multiple levels of signification that come along with any text, including binding and typeface – what Jerome McGann calls the bibliographic code – glosses in their various forms take on new and multiple resonances within any text. In "Glossing the Flesh: Scopophilia and the Margins of the Medieval Book," Michael Camille suggests that the margins of the text are spaces for interaction and dissent in medieval books, but often contemporary scholarship has looked past or ignored this space of dissent. Camille finds that textual criticism has suffered

> partly because since the nineteenth century scholars have tended to see the book as a static, closed object, as a medieval encyclopaedic summa. In this sense the book comes to represent what Derrida terms 'the idea of a totality . . . the encyclopaedic protection of the theology and of logocentrism against the disruption of writing' and is used to explain everything from the Gothic cathedral to the system of medieval aesthetics. (Camille 246)

For Camille, breaking from this totality comes in the invitation to readers to write in the margins, and this invitation is initiated by the absence of marginal commentary. The abundance of space on the edge of the page is a physical space for commentary and dissent, and the extra-textual gloss that readers contribute eventually becomes a part of the text itself. Here the reader physically becomes a part of the text, materially contributing to the textual makeup of the text. Camille is particularly interested in the more famous marginal writers, and even mentions Samuel Taylor Coleridge, whose marginal notes in his own and other people's texts have led to significant studies, such as H.J. Jackson's edition of Coleridge's marginalia *A Book I Value: Selected Marginalia*. In *Navigations* this sort of assessment meets with mixed success. The physical makeup of the text does present moments for the reader to write in the margins, but it is contingent on the specific text. There are some texts in *Navigations* that are highly glossed, where others have next to nothing. There are even some that contain a mixture of the two. The margins themselves are not as generous as some, but there is enough room generally for an interested reader to make short comments in the margins of the text. In the digital text I have used for this study (see above, p 5-6), however, there appear to be few if any marginal comments from readers.

Camille's interest in the readers' commentary does suggest a disruption in the nineteenth-century 'totality' he sees alive in the academy, but because he is interested in handwritten glosses only, his criticism does not take into account the fluidity of the text before it falls into the hands of the reader. It is also important to note that while another reader's handwritten gloss encourages subsequent readerly commentary, initially it is the absence of marginal notes that encourages the reader's participation. For Camille, the reader's gloss and the gloss added by an editor do very different ideological work. The editor's marginal note is perceived as a part of the text as a whole, closing down interpretation and aiding in constructing a static and closed text of the sort that Camille finds operating in the nineteenth century. The hand-written gloss signals a kind of dissent, a transgressive act where the reader crosses the boundary from receiver of information to active participant in the construction of the text. Camille expands the reader to editor, asserting that the blank space in the margin is an invitation to the reader to comment on the text, but the existence of printed marginal notes can do a similar thing. The totality that Camille finds working in nineteenth-century texts does not work for *Navigations* precisely because of the ways in which the marginal commentary is shown to be written by someone other than the author of the text, but also because of the content of the marginal notes. The confrontation of perspective that happens in several places in *Navigations*, and the exposure of the desires of the compilers themselves – the presentation of a list of instructions – shows multiple interests at work in the construction of the text. In *Navigations* there are many moments where the writer of the marginal note and the writer of the main text are clearly different people (see below), and this sends the reader similar signals to those sent by the handwritten marginal gloss. The moments of dissent and disagreement that occur between various texts also occur in the marginal commentary. Recognizing that the author of the main text is not the author of the marginal gloss also invokes the Derridian *hors texte*, where something other than the author becomes the boundary of the text. This configuration of the *hors texte* encourages participation from all readers. Comments that signal dissent or approval do as much to control the reception of the text as they do to open a space for further participation.

Camille's rather slight injunction to textual scholarship is not the only voice thinking of revising textual scholarship. D. C. Greetham is much more aggressive than Camille, and in his introductory essay "The Resistance to Philology" in *The Margins of the Text* he argues for a wide scale re-evaluation of textual practices in the academy. Greetham takes aim at theorists like Richard Lanham, Jonathan Culler, and Paul de Man, who he claims have mothballed philological study, claiming they adhere to the nineteenth-century, logocentric critical models of which Camille and Derrida are so critical. Greetham's title echoes two companion pieces by Culler, "The Return to Philology" and "The Resistance to Theory," texts that Greetham claims double-handedly assessed philology as critically bankrupt and uncovered an institutional bias against theory. Greetham suggests that the tables have turned, and that the academy now uncritically dismisses textual scholarship in the way Culler suggested it used to dismiss theory. According to Greetham, the critics who attack philology are still attacking the academy of the 1960's, that same academy that Culler found so entrenched against theory. Greetham suggests that these scholars are themselves

> laboring under an outmoded view of the philological model that textual critics as diverse as Jerome McGann, D. F. McKenzie, and [Edward] Tanselle have frequently called into question, as witness Tanselle's insistence on the one hand that it is a delusion to think that textual scholarship is prehermeneutic, or that it 'merely prepares the way for scholarly criticism and is not itself part of the critical process,' and on the other that the old collocation of bibliography and science will not withstand scrutiny. (Greetham 10)

Greetham argues that the critics of textual and bibliographical scholarship fail to recognize that textual criticism has already internalized the theoretical project and is deploying key elements of it within its own field. Much of textual scholarship, and certainly that which is concerned with marginalia, makes good use of post-structuralist theory. Considering Derrida's long interest in textual form and a text's boundaries, it indeed seems a perfect fit to read new bibliographical studies as participating in the contemporary theoretical project. Indeed, Derrida's notion of the exerge, that greets the reader as an epigraph to many of Derrida's texts, is not unlike McGann's concept of the bibliographic code.

Greetham's indignation is as much about the tenacity of misconception as it is about misconception itself. He rightly points out that throughout the 1980s textual critics like D.F. McKenzie and Jerome McGann were trying to set the record straight about textual scholarship's goals and practices, but argues that their intervention has not been embraced by the academy. Still, Greetham finds a bias against progressive new philological and bibliographic study. The argument twenty years ago was set within different prejudices than it is currently. In *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, McKenzie quotes Sir Walter Greg's assessment of the duties of the bibliographer: "what the bibliographer is concerned with is pieces of paper or parchment covered with certain written or printed signs. With these signs he is concerned merely as arbitrary remarks; their meaning is no business of his" (McKenzie, 27). McKenzie counters this with what he calls analytical bibliography, wherein the bibliographer contributes to the analysis of the text he is editing or compiling. McKenzie suggests that the purview of the analytical bibliographer must extend to analysis, suggesting that, "If a medium in any sense affects a message, then bibliography cannot exclude from its own proper concerns the relation between form, function and symbolic meaning" (McKenzie, 28). Mckenzie suggests that not only is the bibliographer interested in meaning, but his understanding of where meaning is located is not limited to the central text. The signification of the text is affected by all elements, again much like McGann's bibliographic code. Greetham and McKenzie are fighting the same foe, but Greetham's despair over the entrenched anti-bibliographic academy appears at least in part to undervalue McKenzie's substantial influence. McKenzie's critical work in the 1980s has laid the groundwork for a progressive field of analytical bibliographers whose breadth of scope McKenzie thought possible in 1985. Many recent publications like Andrew Murphy's *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality,* Jennifer Andersen's and Elizabeth Sauer's collection *Books and Readers in Early Modern England*, and David Finkelstein's and Alistair McCleery's

The Book History Reader indicate that the second wave of textual criticism has hit shore.

According to W. E. Slights, contemporary material scholarship has recently taken a new interest in marginalia, particularly in the early modern period. In "The Cosmopolitics of Reading," Slights' contribution to Greetham's collection *The Margins of the Text*, he suggests that side notes were a relatively common occurrence in early modern books, and that their position in the text elicits a particular signification:

> Considering that well over half the books produced in early modern England contain printed side notes and that other forms of what Gérard Genette calls 'paratext' abound in printed works of the period, it is easy to see why textual studies that extend their concerns beyond the 'clear,' centered text have begun to appear. (Slights 202)

Slights' assertion simultaneously constructs a paradigm of early modern textual practices and locates a more contemporary critical position. Well over half the texts in *Navigations* have some sort of gloss, most of which are side notes. There are texts that have no emendation, such as instructional narratives, some of the letters, and the ships' log that comes with John Davis's voyage in search of a north west passage in 1587 (Hakluyt 1600, 115). Slights' critical intervention – and his invocation of Genette – points to a nuance in contemporary scholarship in a contentious field of study. While Genette may not be clearly a post-structuralist critic, his deployment in textual criticism leads the field some distance from what Greetham calls the academy's tendency to think of textual or bibliographic criticism as grammatical (as though grammar was static or mathematic), and signals a significant shift in textual scholarship of the early modern period.

As mentioned, in *Navigations* there are many different people who participate in writing the marginal notes, including Hakluyt. Any attempt to ascertain who wrote the marginalia in the various texts in *Navigations* would require a book-length study, one filled with its share of tedium. Within the texts taken up here, it is clear that Hakluyt often used multiple sources and, as a result, made several minor editorial changes in each text. There are narratives included in *Navigations* that differ significantly from extant manuscripts (see below), and the marginal commentary appears to follow a similar pattern. It is likely that Hakluyt wrote some of the marginal comments in *Navigations*, but there are many instances where Hakluyt inherits marginal comments and does not change them. George Best's *True Discourse* is printed by Henry Bynnyman in 1578, and although Hakluyt does cut some of the text, the marginalia precedes Hakluyt. Because of the diversity of the texts within *Navigations*, it is also impossible to maintain a uniform purpose for the marginalia therein.

Hakluyt's printing methods seem to have a rather high rate of textual attrition, another significant roadblock in ascertaining the authors of the marginal notes. In an entry on Guinea in *The Hakluyt Handbook*, Paul Hair tells us that many of the texts Hakluyt was dealing with were relatively rare, and he often destroyed the manuscripts in the printing process. This leads Hair to question the value of Hakluyt's textual legacy:

> Non survival is so regularly the case that it would seem that Hakluyt collected the only manuscript copy of any account, and that this copy was destroyed in the printing process. It follows that we must ask an

> ungracious question: would we now be better off for our sources if Hakluyt had not made his collection? On the one hand, manuscripts collected by Hakluyt are not now extant (and whatever you think of Hakluyt's editing, we know that the texts he passed on to Purchas were mangled in printing) while the manuscripts he did not collect are extant. Yet on the other hand, Hakluyt has preserved for us Baker's poems [recounting his voyages to Guinea], whose original print has not survived. Surely some of the manuscripts have been similarly lost in the course of centuries; and may it not have been the good influence of the *Principal Navigations* which enabled some of the accounts which were not included to survive? (Hair 207)

Hair's logic seems reasonable, as it seems at the very least that Hakluyt destroyed some rather rare texts in his reprinting process. The absence of many of Hakluyt's sources makes it impossible to assess potential changes to the manuscripts with absolute certainty. To what degree Hakluyt can be seen as a protector of textual history or an abuser and distorter of it will forever remain an open question.

In spite of these textual difficulties with *Navigations*, it is still possible to make educated guesses regarding the source and authorship of marginal notes for texts whose manuscripts are no longer extant. Where multiple texts exist, and in the ones I have taken up in more detail in chapter three, it appears that Hakluyt's editorial practices are a bit unpredictable once again. There are moments where Hakluyt does not stray very far from other existing manuscripts. Morgan and Coote's collation of Jenkinson's series of texts shows little change until the privileges granted to England by Tsar Ivan in 1569, and Jenkinson's text of his dealings in Russia from 1571–1572. Of the Russian privileges, Morgan and Coote state that "There are two drafts of these privileges in the State Paper Office (S.P., Domestic Eliz., vols. 54 and 196). One of these agrees with Hakluyt's version; the other, and obviously the correct one, differs materially" (Morgan and Coote 265 n, 1). They do not state what material differences exist between the two texts, nor do they state why the manuscript that disagrees with Hakluyt is obviously the correct one. With Jenkinson's text, they suggest that Lansdowne MS 100 "appears to be in Jenkinson's handwriting, and differs widely from Hakluyt's version, in which much is omitted" (Morgan and Coote 306 n. 1).

Comparing other extant manuscripts to Hakluyt's text we can see that there are moments where Hakluyt appears to be as unobtrusive as possible. Where multiple manuscripts exist there is evidence of minor editorial interference, but these emendations usually number only a few words (Morgan and Coote, 126-128). With the Jenkinson series of voyages and letters patent, there are two manuscripts that still exist outside of *Navigations*. Within the voyages themselves there are four moments where Hakluyt's text is not consistent with the other two manuscripts, but these amount to no more than a handful of words (Morgan and Coote 121-156). Between pages 121 and 156, Morgan and Coote take up Jenkinson's 1561 voyage to Russia, collating Hakluyt's text with manuscripts in the Hatfield and Helmington Hall collections. They thoroughly work through all extant texts pointing out where *Navigations* differs from other texts. By and large *Navigations* is their copy-text because it is the largest and the most complete. When comparing *Navigations* to the other sources, they state that "in the few instances where a different reading [from *Navigations*] occurs in the MS., it is given at the foot of the page" (Morgan and Coote 121, n. 1). There are two moments where a change in *Navigations* is not found in either manuscript – a fact that at least hints at a third manuscript now lost – and there are a few moments where Hakluyt's text conforms to one of the two manuscripts. Because Hakluyt appears to have used marginal commentary included in the manuscripts he obtains, finding any sort of ideological consistency in the marginalia proves impossible. Because of the divergence in editorial practices before Hakluyt gets hold of a text, and the variance in authorial interest, the marginal notes serve multiple purposes.

The difficulty in ascertaining authorship of the marginalia in *Navigations* would not bother Elizabeth Sauer or Jennifer Andersen. In the collection of essays *Books and Readers in Early Modern England*, Andersen and Sauer reject this sort of inquiry, suggesting that much of contemporary scholarship has passed over much more interesting questions in search of the banal:

> In general, early modern books seem to have been more dynamic and fluid, less dogmatic and authoritarian than some modern stereotypes would imply. An overemphasis on concerns with authenticity and authorship may have distracted us from what contemporaries took to be essential features of print culture: its instability, permeability, sociability, and adaptability to particular occasions and readerships. (Andersen and Sauer 1)

The fluidity of the text for Anderson and Sauer is a fundamental state of the text, and is something that needs to be understood within specific social and textual contexts. Anderson and Sauer argue that the mad dash to discover an authentic text effaces the fundamental fluidity of the text. These critics, it would appear, have limited themselves and certainly placed themselves in a potentially anachronistic position, recreating a totalized text and a reading experience that would not resemble the early modern experience.

It would appear that Sauer and Andersen are distancing themselves from textual critics that Greetham says no longer exist. While a stereotype does not a critical position make, the different angles of perception regarding the same field of study show that the field itself is more diverse than either assessment affords. Sauer and Andersen imply that the conservative philologist does indeed exist, the editor satisfied with simply preparing the text for interpretation, either unwilling or unable to make any critical or theoretical comment. Conversely, both point out that more progressive or inclusive textual critics are also at work in the field, bringing a diverse set of theoretical and critical practices to the task of bibliography.

Their assessment also hints at interests that lie in discovering the concerns of a particular time and place. Much of the textual criticism kicked off by McKenzie and McGann criticizes the way certain critical concerns influence the analysis. Indeed, D.F. McKenzie critiques of Wimsatt and Beardsley asserting that they make just this sort of mistake. It is a material error that leads Wimsatt and Beardsley astray, as their epigraph misquotes William Congreve. This oversight is partly due to sloppy scholarship – everyone should be able to agree that misquoting a text is a scholarly taboo – but a significant and often overlooked element of Wimsatt and Beardsley's mistake is not just that they misquote an author, but where the mistake occurs in the essay. The misquotation of Congreve's poem comes in the epigraph, and it is no coincidence that a mistake in the margin was not taken seriously. It is precisely because it is in an epigraph, something at the borders of the main text, that the error goes unexamined and uncorrected for as long as it does. This oversight shows that interest and scholarly rigor focused on the main text relax at its borders, a lapse that has dire consequences for interpretation and meaning. The epigraph is one of the first things the reader reads, and certainly influences the meaning of the text, setting up a hinge between the critical argument in the main text and a wider textual interest. Again, the clarion call here is for the diversity in critical perspective. The point is not that an author who is sloppy in the margins of a text will certainly be sloppy in the main text as well – although this is not a completely unreasonable assertion – but rather that the critics who followed in Wimsatt's and Beardsley's footsteps followed a far too narrow definition of the text. McKenzie suggests that not only is the author important to understanding the meaning of the text, but so too are the marginal notes, epigraph, index, font, and binding. Each of these things has an impact on the way we understand and read a text. With *Navigations*, the question obviously arises, how does one read a text with such an immense diversity of authors, theme, form, and marginalia?

Marginal Navigations

In *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books*, the book that grows out of Slights' essay in *The Margins of the Text,* Slights lists thirteen possible meaning effects of early modern printed marginalia. Marginal commentary has been deployed to multiple ends, at times providing context, endorsing or opposing the main text, or cross-referencing sections of the text, but all marginalia is designed to direct or construct reading. In effect it is impossible for marginalia not to work as an ideological device. Even commentary that urges subjective speculation, i.e. a note that reflexively makes the reader a part of the text, asks the reader to read in a specific way. Within *Principal Navigations* the marginalia accomplish a variety of different goals, and at times are contradictory. Within Jenkinson's series of travel texts, for instance, the marginal notes emphasize certain elements of the main text, highlighting a memorable moment by restating it in the margin. This works as an indexing device, creating a shorthand where the reader can skim the main text through the margins. Here, the editor is adding little or no ideological content. The marginal note is actually a part of the main text, but it does highlight elements of the text under a rubric of relative importance. Here the ideology is the manipulation of the manifest content, the editor underscoring what is important for the reader. The marginal note adds emphasis while streamlining future readings. In many of the early exploratory texts in *Navigations* the marginal note simply repeats the date from the main text, echoing the temporal trajectory of the voyage for the reader.

Navigations has often been cited as a tool for future exploration and discovery (see above 1-10), and the marginal notes in Jenkinson's texts create a dialogue between the main text and the gloss that opens several different reading practices. The main text's attention to geographical detail and natural circumstances throughout the various texts shows the value they hold for future voyagers. Where the marginal note adds some qualification to the main text the gloss is usually brief and subtle, but nonetheless there. In Anthony Jenkinson's first voyage to Russia there is a reference to the famous whirlpool off the coast of Norway:

> there is between the said Rost Islands & Lofoot, a whirle poole called Malestrand, [Note in marg: Malestrand a strange whirle poole.] which from halfe ebbe vntill halfe flood, maketh such a terrible noise, that it shaketh the ringes in the doores of the inhabitants houses of the sayd Islands tenne miles off. (Hakluyt 1598, 312)

This is a rather simple sidenote, presenting a slight interpretation of the main text. The marginal note points out a familiar, if nevertheless strange, natural phenomenon, creating an indexical moment for someone skimming to find information on the Malström, or simply highlighting an interesting moment in the text. The marginal note is slightly different from the main text, suggesting that the phenomenon is strange, but does little to color the text. Other glosses signify much differently. In the narrative for "The true report of all the successe of Famagusta, made by the Earle Nestor Martiningo, unto the renowmed Prince the Duke of Venice," the marginal gloss to the date, 1571, states,

> In Italy and other places the date of the yere of ye Lord is always changed the first of January, or on New yeres day, and from that day reckoned upon: although wee heere in England, especially the temporall lawyers for certaine causes are not woont to alter the same untill the Annunciaton of our Ladie. (Hakluyt 1598, 121)

The substance of this note is interpretive, presenting a discrepancy in calendars for readers unfamiliar with this cultural difference, but there is a subjective element to the note as well. The note does make an assumption about the nationality of the audience it is addressing. The note presents objective facts, sorting out a discrepancy in different calendars, but subjectively speaks to a specifically English audience. The length of the note also makes it a rather cumbersome indexical tool, suggesting that the side note is as important as the main text.

In Frobisher's voyage of 1577 the marginal notes present an editor at war with himself, at times busily commenting in the margins and other times making no comment at all. The first page (*Navigations* 1598, 310) has a few sparse comments that mark a temporal progression of the voyage, the marginal note repeating exactly what is written in the body of the text. The next two pages, however, are much more strenuously appended. Along with the comment on the whirlpool mentioned above, pages 311 and 312 show an active editor, defining terms, adding detail, and giving some extra-historical context. In the rest of the document the marginal commentary drops out almost entirely. The marginal notes accomplish several things here. The monthly indicators divide the text much like chapter breaks or headings. The swift passage of the months – the text moves from June to December within three pages – suggests that this is a highly compressed text presenting essentials only. Most of the marginal commentary makes rather banal assertions, simply reiterating the main text, but there are a few moments where the commentary shows a hint of personal perspective. The suggestion that the main text offers "good counsell for travellers" (Hakluyt 1598, 311) emphasizes instruction for the reader, but most often the marginal commentary attempts to present an objective point of view.

Some instructional texts with a high degree of detail use marginal notes to fulfill a significant function. There are descriptions of the shore of Norway, elaborate descriptions of various islands, and even some text devoted to the people of the various places the explorers pass. In each case the marginal note simply marks time, creating a tempo of the text, calculating the pace of the narrative. It is clear that the bulk of Frobisher's narrative is preoccupied with the material circumstances of the voyage. The meticulous detail regarding geography and weather in the main text creates a template for what to expect on the voyage, allowing sailors and merchants alike to weigh the risks of the venture and potential future ones. It also shows that the editor of the marginal notes has no obvious political or social agenda, other than perhaps an interest in encouraging future safe travel. It is also clear that each set of texts regarding Frobisher's voyages show a subtle difference in perspective. On each voyage there certainly would be fantastic and surprising occurrences combined with a significant amount of tedium. From Frobisher's voyages, Hall, Settle, Ellis, and Best all contribute narratives but only Christopher Hall makes reference to the Malström. There is a chance that Ellis and Settle are working from Hall's narrative and do not wish to repeat facts present in the first narrative, but Best's omission is strange, especially since he is the more flowery of the writers (see chapter 3).

In both cases, the marginal gloss aids the reader and facilitates multiple reading practices. Where the marginal gloss adds some sort of critique, as with the above description of the whirlpool as "straunge," the intertextual dialogue is as much an indexical tool as an ideological construct. It is possible for a reader encountering the text for the first time to read the marginal notes first, turning to the main text only when the marginal note piques the interest of the reader. The marginal gloss allows readers to bypass unnecessary context according to their particular agenda, be they investigating moments of wonder, cannibalism, or points of contact and indigenous cultures and practices. In this way the absence of a marginal gloss can emphasize the importance of the main text. As with Camille's observation above, the absence of any marginal gloss can work to encourage the reader to provide them, implicitly resisting the foregrounding of any information in the main text.

The descriptive marginal note allows a reader to skim the text more efficiently than a simple reference to the date, but both facilitate what Peter Stallybrass calls discontinuous reading. In "Books and Scrolls: Navigating the Bible," Stallybrass suggests that the shift from scroll culture to codex culture is as significant a technological shift as the shift from manuscript culture to movable-type print culture:

> The fifteenth century was a period of comparable change, and one might want to see the invention of printing less as a displacement of manuscript culture than as the culmination of the invention of the navigable book – the book that allowed you to get your finger into the place you wanted to find in the least possible time. (Stallybrass 44)

Stallybrass proceeds from a materialist perspective, suggesting that the shift in technology has profound implications for the structure and arrangement of human thought. Because scroll technology limited the reader's ability to jump from section to section in a given text, any subsequent return to the text usually meant reading it continuously as with the first reading. In *The Birth of the Codex* Colin Roberts and T.C. Skeat come to similar conclusions about the Christian adoption of the codex form and its potential effects. Roberts and Skeat suggest that generally the cultural shift from scroll technology to codex technology was a slow process, "the Christian adoption of the codex seems to have been instant and universal" (Roberts and Skeat 53, and Eisenstein 155-162). Roberts and Skeat also remark on the possibility that the codex form allows for a greater ease of reference:

> It has been suggested that it would have been much easier to locate a particular passage in a Biblical text written in codex form than it would be in a roll, and that this would have been a decided advantage in the cut and thrust of theological debate. (Roberts and Skeat, 50)[16]

They cite the famous 'Tolle, Lege' event, where "Augustine kept a finger in the codex of the Pauline epistles to mark the place of the providential passage he had found (Roberts and Skeat 50). Certainly indexical markers in the margins would further facilitate this sort of referencing.

While the marginal notes allow for discontinuous reading, those that add emphasis are doubly capable of allowing the reader access to specific moments in the text without reading the main text in full. The presentation of the date only is rarely enough to give a reader unfamiliar with the text enough information to access anything of value on a first read. Narratives that primarily include this sort of marginal note encourage an initial close reading of the text. In the previous analysis of Jenkinson's four voyages, I argued that the construction and placement of the texts create a hermeneutical relationship with the reader, where information included in earlier voyages is omitted because it becomes redundant. Because the vast majority of marginal notes in *Navigations* are organizational, they are not fully effective until read in consort with the main text continuously.

---

[16] Strangely, Roberts and Skeat do not state who has suggested this argument.

In other parts of *Navigations* the marginal notes emphasize or translate certain terms and phrases. As a general rule, Hakluyt provides full-text translations of any Latin text he includes, or finds translations to include alongside the original. This is not consistently observed, however, and there are texts in *Navigations* that remain untranslated, and translated texts without the original. Translations of specific phrases or terms, however, are usually marked off with some symbol, usually an asterisk, a line, or a rectangular box. Translational notes mostly update main-text information, or provide alternate spellings of words the reader might be unfamiliar with. The main text regarding Thomas Southam's and John Sparke's voyage to Russia states, "Wee departed from Vassian at the breake of the day, and came to a place called, Selucax, where we lay all night, and is 10 miles from Vassian" (Hakluyt 1598, 367). The main text is marked with a rectangular box before Selucax, and the corresponding marginal note states, "Or, Sermaxe" (Hakluyt 1598, 367).[17] Here the marginal note signals the recognition of a potential change in signification and provides an alternative for a reader who might be familiar with a different term. Most of the time the marginal note is confident in its assessment as with the above example, clearly offering a known substitute. Occasionally, however, the marginal note evokes a more cautious tone. With Arthur Edwards' letter to the Muscovy Company, the marginal note dispenses with the symbolic indicator and muses, "By the word Karangies, I think they meane Karsies" (Hakluyt 1598, 363).

---

[17] This side note might be little help to more modern readers. Indeed, I was unable to find any reference to either place in any text outside of *Navigations*. I eventually found out, with the help of Russian-speaking friend Karine Hopper, that the place is now called

In this last example, it is clear that the writer of the marginal note is not the same as the author of the main text. The letter is written in 1567, and in spite of the whimsical tone of clarification, is clearly someone attempting to interpret Edwards' letter. Strangely, it is not odd for a letter to be glossed in *Navigations*, even though there are some that are not. In the case of any private letter, the marginalia would be written by someone other than the author without his or her consent. It is possible in some cases for consent to be subsequently given, but for the vast majority of the marginal commentary, the authors remain unknown. It is often the case that the identity of the marginal writer will forever remain unknown. The letter as a genre has many different connotations within *Navigations*. There are letters included in *Navigations* that clearly have a more official tone, like the letters between Tsar Ivan and Queen Elizabeth, most of which suggest a larger readership than simply the sender and receiver.

There are marginal notes that refer to other texts in *Navigations*. "The Voyage of Johannes de Plano Carpini unto the Northeast parts of the world, in the yeere of our Lord, 1246" (Hakluyt 1598, 53) follows a standard pattern, organizing the narrative through subject headings. Under the heading "Of their forme, habite, and maner of living"

Sermaks. It is on the Neva River, east of Belarus near St. Petersburg.

(Hakluyt 1598, 54) the text not surprisingly describes the people, customs, and apparel of Russia in a clear and deliberate way:

> But they weare Iackets framed after a strange manner, of buckeram, skarlet, or Baldakines. Their shoubes or gownes are hayrie on the outside, and open behinde, with tailes hanging downe to their hammes. (Hakluyt 1598, 54)

The marginal gloss, however, qualifies this in a peculiar and anachronistic way, suggesting their dress is "Like unto Frobishers men" (Hakluyt 1598, 54). It is unclear whether this gloss refers to the length, style, colour, or everything, but clearly Carpini is not the author of the marginal gloss. It is in fact likely that Hakluyt is the author of this note, offering a cross-reference to another section of his own collection. The note gestures both to Frobisher's voyagers, people who exist several hundred years in the future at the moment of this text, and to another moment in *Navigations*, where Frobisher's narrative waits several hundred pages on. The transhistorical nature of this note not only qualifies the text, and allows for discontinuous reading within Plano Carpini's text, but within *Navigations* as well.

Up until this point I have discussed how the marginal sidenote commented on the main text or pointed the reader to other passages or texts within *Navigations*. There are moments, however, where the marginal note points outside of itself to other texts altogether. There are, within the margins and elsewhere, numerous references to classical scholars, including Pliny the elder, Aristotle, and Plutarch. Most of these are reference notes, attempting in some way to square contemporary accounts with classical authority.

Other marginal notes express a cultural or religious position, expressing endorsement or dissent. The letters of John Newbury are generously glossed, and often add substantial color to the main text. When the author discusses his imprisonment at the hands of the Catholic authorities in Goa, he surprisingly mentions the kindness of several priests who attend them:

> for had it not pleased God to put into the minds of the archbishop and other two Padres or Iesuits of S. *Pauls* colledge to stand our friends, we might haue rotted in prison. The archbishop is a very good man, who hath two yong men to his seruantes, the one of them was borne at *Hamborough,* and is called *Bernard Borgers:* and the other was borne at *Enchuyen,* whose name is *Iohn Linscot,* who did vs great pleasure: for by them the archbishop was many times put in minde of vs. And the two good fathers of S. *Paul,* who trauelled very much for vs, the one of them is called Padre *Marke,* who was borne in *Bruges* in *Flanders,* and the other was borne in *Wilshire* in *England,* and is called *Padre Thomas Steuens.* (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 243)

The marginal note for this section states that Jan Huyghen van Linschoten is "The author of the book of the east Indies" (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 249). The marginal note creates an extra-textual context, telling the reader what John Linscot accomplished. Since Linscot's history of the East Indies is not in *Navigations*, the marginal note asks the reader to look outside of the collection as well. Here Hakluyt's policy of non-interference (unless he writes the marginal notes himself) points beyond the limits of his collection, similar to the many references to classical texts. *Navigations* exposes its own limitations through a self-reflexive extra-textual marginal note.

This sort of marginal note is most often deployed within an argumentative text. If the text is designed to prove a point, as Humphrey Gilbert's text is when arguing for the possibility of a northwest passage, the marginalia justify, parody, support, or detract from the main text. Whoever writes the marginal notes to Gilbert's ten-chapter tract arguing for the existence of a northwest passage clearly supports Gilbert's efforts. Often the margins contain supporting information, justifying the text through example and precise citations. When discussing the origins of the Indigenous people of the new world, Gilbert writes, "it seemeth likely that they [Indigenous people] should come by the Northwest, because the coast whereon they were driven, lay East from this our passage" (Hakluyt 1600, 19). The marginal note endorses this claim, if somewhat pedantically, stating "True, both in ventis obliquè flantibus, as also in ventis ex diametro spirantibus."

There are moments where the marginal note is clearly filling in lacunae left by the main text, something that an educated editor like Hakluyt would be able to supply. As with any good academic essay, Gilbert cites many sources in his defense, mostly classical and biblical, but he is not always scrupulous in the precision of his citation. The marginal notes often come to his aid, giving chapter and verse where Gilbert either does not or cannot. When the main text makes a reference to Japeth, the marginal note gives the precise location of the reference: "Valerius Anselmus in Catologo annorum & prinipium. Fol 6. Gen 9.10" (Hakluyt 1600, 11). There are also times where Gilbert leaves the job half finished, and, once again the marginal gloss fills in the gaps in his references. When discussing the precedence for certain word borrowing, part of a protracted argument suggesting that the Northwest Passage was known B.C.E., the notes give detailed citations for the vague references made in the main text. Gilbert suggests

> That Aristotle (who was 300 yeeres before Christ) named Mare Indicum. Also Berosus (who lived 330 yeres before Christ) hath these words, Ganges in India. Also in the first chapter of Hester be these wordes, In the days of Assuerus lived 580 yeeres before Christ. (Hakluyt 1600, 20)

The main text gives a reference for the biblical text but not for anything else. Again, the marginal note does the scholarly work for him, giving a precise citation for "Aristotle lib. De mundo, cap. 2. [and] Berosus lib. 5." The marginal note is not necessarily a signpost – although it can work this way as well – but it clarifies the references from the main text, only interjecting when something is left out. In each case the reference is not absolutely accurate, giving the text but not the exact citation, but they do at least reference the text. In Gilbert's text, the hermeneutical progression I discussed earlier in Jenkinson's series of texts is compressed with the aid of the marginal writer. Gilbert's text looks much like a contemporary scholarly essay in the humanities, with logical argumentation supported by authorities from the field. The main text and the marginalia work together to create a coherent whole; the marginal writer fills in technical and textual gaps left by the original author.

For most of the narratives involved in the Northwest Passage debate it is likely that someone other than the author of the main text writes the marginal notes. As mentioned, most likely someone other than Gilbert wrote the marginal notes for his *Discourse for proving the possibility of a north west passage.* The manuscript for *Discourse*, written in 1566, is now lost. In *The Voyages and Colonising Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert,* D. B. Quinn states that "the only form in which we have the 'discourse' is that which was printed in 1576" (Quinn, *Gilbert* 8). This edition, by Henry Middleton, is reprinted in *Navigations* in 1600, but Hakluyt omits Gascoigne's introduction to the reader in the 1600 volume of *Navigations* (Quinn, *Gilbert* 129 n1). Quinn also asserts that there is no clear evidence that Gascoigne has Gilbert's permission to print the text, and that the 1577 edition contains "a certain amount of material added by Gilbert between 1570 and 1576, and possibly certain editorial changes made by George Gascoigne (Quinn, *Gilbert* 8). The marginal notes in the 1576 version are the same as the marginal notes in *Navigations.* It seems unlikely that Gilbert would precisely identify certain references in the main text and others in the marginal note. Most likely the references added are by Gascoigne, or perhaps the printer Henry Middleton. There are other narratives participating in the Northwest Passage debate that clearly show evidence of an outside editorial hand as well. In Richard Willes' narrative in support of the possibility of a northwest passage, the marginal note claims that the source text is wrong. Willes' main text makes a rather suppositional statement, which seems to invite a response. After pointing out the direction of the winds and flow of ocean currents, Willes charts a path he presumes the Spanish take to the new world saying it is "The way no doubt the Spaniards would commodiously take, for that it lyeth neere unto their dominions there, could the Easterne current and levant windes as easily suffer them to returne, as speedily therewith they may be carried thither" (Hakluyt 1599: sec II, 24).

Next to this nautical theorizing, the marginal note simply states, "This is an errour." Clearly this is not a comment from the author, but from an editor, who strangely points out a problem, ostensibly correcting it, but offers no concrete alternative reference or correction. This shows a peculiar editorial move. The text is not excised or amended. The mistake is left in but deliberately and overtly corrected in the margins.

In most early modern books the gloss is located in the margin, directly adjacent to the text it qualifies, or is qualified by, and *Navigations* follows this convention. By the nineteenth century, the marginal gloss all but disappears, supplanted by the footnote and the endnote. Critics like Lawrence Lipking have suggested that this indicates a shift in the use and effect of the gloss, marking a hierarchical distinction where the main text dominates the margins, but there are those who argue with his assertion (Lipking and Slights *Managing Readers*). According to Lipking, the movement of the marginal note marks a progressive devolution of its significatory influence of the marginal note. Lipking suggests that the marginal side note interacts with the main text dialogically. The footnote is subordinate to the main text, and the endnote merely supplemental. The opposition to Lipking's analysis, from critics like William Slights and Evelyn Tribble, removes the hierarchical distinction between side, footnotes, and endnote, leaving the gloss much more elastic. This latter assessment certainly fits more comfortably with an analysis of *Navigations*. A side marginal note can direct a reader to a specific moment within itself, as with Jenkinson's narrative, or it can do the reverse, the main text pointing to the marginal note to add context and detailed information, as with Carpini's text. It can be understood merely as supplementary, as with Gilbert's biblical reference, or it can add specific colour to the main text as with Jenkinson's reference to the Malestõm. The note can agree with or endorse the main text, again as with Gilbert's text, or it can disagree as with Richard Willis' text. The side note does work much more successfully as an index than foot or endnotes. It is not the most efficient of indexes, but it does work, and aids in discontinuous reading. It would seem overly cumbersome to use endnotes or footnotes as an index to the main text, but again, it is possible. The signification of the side gloss – and I would side with Tribble and Sleights in their assessment that this fits for foot and end notes as well – is less about hierarchy than it is about dialogue. Even if a side note is interested in controlling the meaning of a text, the very presence of marginalia, and the participatory action they urge, suggests that the side note could have the opposite effect.

Most of the ways in which Slights suggests marginal notes signify in early modern texts are represented in *Navigations*. In many cases, the style and content of the marginalia perform several functions at once, allowing for discontinuous reading, organizing, glossing etc. The correction noted above, where the marginal note suggests "by the word Karangies, I think they meane Karsies" (Hakluyt 1598, 363), is both a potential translation and correction. Similarly, the dialogic movement from margins to centre of the text fills in lacunae and adds material as they mark the progress of the narrative itself. There are moments where Slights' categories do not have a clear representative narrative in *Navigations,* however. The pre-emptive seems a bit of a rarity if it exists at all. It would seem odd and cumbersome to completely cover all white space on the page. This may eventually happen as readers interject their own marginal commentary, but it seems unlikely that a printer would add marginalia to prevent writing in the text. If the former happens in any given text, surely the margin comments would come from a variety of readers with different critical perspectives. There are some heavily glossed texts in *Navigations*, but none that completely extinguish the possibility of the reader commenting in the margin. Caesar Frederick's text of his voyage to India is the most heavily glossed in *Navigations*, but there is still some marginal space for digression or support. Frederick was a Venetian merchant who travelled extensively in India. Robert Kerr suggests that someone named Hickocke translated his narratives and letters along with Richard Hakluyt for *Navigations* (Kerr 89 and, Tennant 489). There is no other extant copy of this text that I can find, and it is likely that either Hakluyt or Hickocke write the marginal notes.

The Source of *Navigations*

The multiple textual forms included in *Navigations* and the various amounts of marginal commentary point to an instability within the text of which Hakluyt surely was aware. The question that remains is how to regulate or control this instability, or, in fact, if this is a desirable or possible goal at all. When dealing with early modern texts, the question is no less problematic. What is the best way to present a text that was produced within a culture of reading and writing drastically different from the present? Do marginal glosses aid in clarifying an accessible text or do they corrupt or bias reading?

At the heart of much textual and bibliographical work is the question of textual preparation and presentation. When dealing with texts published in the early modern period, the question of how to prepare a several hundred year old text for publication is a spirited one indeed. Early modern texts are set within a linguistic and cultural milieu that causes problems for many readers, and glosses have often been used to aid the reader with basic understanding. Glosses that attempt this sort of interpretation are generally geared towards the layman, but it is not inconceivable that the expert can learn from them as well. Texts that have been in circulation for several hundred years also have a better chance of attracting scholarly interest. In *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton*, Leah Marcus takes on this question, suggesting that the bulk of textual emendation that accompanies critical editions of Renaissance texts gives the reader a nineteenth and twentieth century biased perspective on the canonical authors she analyses. She argues that the texts should be presented as they were found in the Renaissance, free from emendation and commentary.

Her assessment that Renaissance texts were largely free from emendation does not square with Camille's argument regarding the impact of the marginal note on the reader, and when turning our attention to Hakluyt we can at best assume that *Navigations*, because of its significant marginalia, is not what Marcus would call a typical Renaissance text. She agrees with Greetham's suggestion that someone other than the author writes the marginalia for most Renaissance texts, but suggests that this happens over a period of years. To be fair, she is dealing with literary texts exclusively, following the accretion of explanatory notes now so familiar in more popular Renaissance texts. For Marcus, too much emendation in the margins exerts a distortive control over the text, potentially creating a biased, historically specific reading. With *Navigations* we can see that the extra textual commentary certainly does betray the ideological underpinnings of various critical positions as well. J. A. Froude's applause for the book clearly has both feet in the glory of the empire, a position still tenable in the middle of the nineteenth century. The later criticism of George Parks reflects a new critical bias, investigating how many well wrought urns actually lie in *Navigations*. Adding these comments to any reprinting of *Navigations,* as unlikely as that may seem, would certainly influence the reception of the text itself. The collections that include elements of *Navigations*, like Morgan's and Coote's *Some Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia*, look a lot like the texts Marcus dislikes. Indeed, this text is dominated by marginal notes, and shows specific, historical editorial concerns. Marcus' theory also appears to rely significantly on the ignorance of the reader. It is unlikely that a sophisticated reader of a sixteenth-century text would accept commentary from the nineteenth century. At the very least this sort of text would provide a context for the historical critical reception of the text. Significant is the fact that those who are more likely to be negatively influenced by non-authorial emendation are precisely those who are more likely to need it. The undergraduate looking for the definitive position on any particular early modern text is more likely to be influenced in the way that Marcus suggests. At the very least, her intervention makes present the absence of an ethics of emendation, and implies the need for a way to mediate the flow of competing elements interested in creating readings of the text.

There are certainly valuable elements in Marcus' theory, but the theoretical position that underwrites her analysis has come under fire recently. Michael Steppat in "(Un)Editing and textual theory: positioning the reader" suggests that unediting potentially makes possible what it seeks to displace. The goal of the uneditor is to free the text from over didactic commentary, where creative reading is limited by the instructions from the margins. Where uneditors suggest that the marginal note limits interpretation because of overly didactic commentary, Steppat suggests that the alienating experience of reading most Renaissance texts does the same thing. Interpretation is either choked off because of misunderstanding or because of overly didactic and autocratic guidance. Removing all of the accumulated commentary at least in part looks to uncover an authentic authorial intention, or a best text. Localizing the invention of the author aside from the invention of editors from any period is for Steppat an overly idealistic goal. He suggests that multiple source texts force editorial intervention which in turn subjectivises the production of texts: "In each case [unediting and traditional editing practices] we are likely to create an argumentative discourse seeking to conceal underlying contradictions, and to prevent our reader from recognizing their existence" (Steppat 73).

Steppat swings to the other end of the spectrum from Marcus, enlisting the help of Michael Best's hypertextual theories to suggest that any and all commentary should be included. While this works best with electronic texts (it seems almost impossible in printed texts), Steppat's goal is not to facilitate the reader's responsibility in producing meaning but to banish it altogether. Steppat argues that when confronted with the surplus of texts, the reader eventually comes to believe that "*How* to put things on a screen may be more fascinating than what you actually *find* there" (Steppat 74).

Within *Navigations* one could argue both ends of the spectrum, locating the text as hyper-glossed or unedited. I would argue that the project Hakluyt claims he is undertaking is very similar to an uneditorial one. That being said, as I have pointed out in previous chapters, it is clear that his editorial hand does influence the way the text signifies in many ways. Because of his approach, there are texts within *Navigations* that are filled with marginalia, like Caesar Frederick's voyage to India, and others with none at all. The textual moment of *Navigations* is a difficult one to ascertain. There are moments where he deliberately leaves a text in its original form, as with *Libell,* and others, Like Caesar Frederick's voyage, where there is significant marginal commentary. One would presume that uneditors would dispense with this biassed commentary since side notes can be said to structure a reading of the main text from the margins. If not, a question lingers: when should extra-textual commentary be included in a text, and when should it be edited out? Is a comment inserted to aid the sixteenth or seventeenth-century reader something that should be excluded from a twenty-first century textual production? It is clear that a large amount of the marginal comments are not the author's work, and do multiple things to the text. Does the fact that someone in the sixteenth century wrote an opinion in the margins make it any more acceptable than someone writing one in the nineteenth?

Unediting also seems to approach a critical practice that looks like historical determinism; at times unediting assumes that reading an unadorned Renaissance text gives insight to the early modern mind. But certainly the marginal commentary that accrues across the centuries also presents critical interests that are in part historically generated. Most early modern texts have gone through multiple editorial processes that shift and pull meaning in different ways. It is clear that Hakluyt's and many other editorial perspectives contribute to the construction of *Navigations*. There are more contemporary studies that have focused on the structure of the text rather than its meaning, but interpretation is never far behind. E. Delmar Morgan and C. H. Coote have extensively collated narratives from within and without *Navigations*, and have discovered places where Hakluyt's apparatus has deviated from or conformed to other extant manuscripts and printed texts. In *Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia by Anthony Jenkinson*, Morgan and Coote include exhaustive explanatory notes that more often than not consume more of the page than the main text. In their study, they discover moments where Hakluyt's text differs from other source texts (see above 167). They include exhaustive references up to the date of publication of all manner of commentary on the text. Their focus is primarily on the preparation of a best text, something that illustrates most accurately what Jenkinson experienced and wrote, a project that lays the groundwork for interpretation *a la* Best, and Steppat.

There seems to be something of an elliptical movement within textual scholarship, a move that at once wishes to examine the architecture of the text without bothering with meaning, and a strong urge to distance textual scholarship from the very practice that they see as overly reductive and restrictive. While this project is invested in the editorial practices of Hakluyt and in the history of the book, it is also interested in how these elements of the text create interpretive possibilities.

When working through the writing of this dissertation, I often proudly proclaimed that I had read Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* several times. After investigating book history theory and textual scholarship I realized that this assessment drastically misrepresents what I actually did. What I meant by this initially was that I had read the book, cover-to-cover, give or take a few texts, twice. This does not take into account the number of times where I reread specific passages, some of which I returned to numerous times. I also discovered that after my first reading of the text, the republication I initially used had left out significant portions of the original text, including all marginal notations. While initially this left me rather upset at the paucity of my first reading, it forced me to return to the text and read the marginalia exclusively. This certainly gave me a different picture of the text, and was a provocative primer for a second read. When I eventually turned to the database *Early English Books Online*, I was able to access a text of *Navigations* that should potentially satisfy both Marcus and Steppat. The database allows for a page-by-page reading of the original printed text, a practice that is exceedingly tedious but necessary in places, but also presents a full text and printable version with links to different passages within *Navigations*. However, the easy access to multiple search engines and online texts make it almost moot to include these on the same page as the text.

The choices that I made in rereading *Navigations* and the sections where I chose to focus my critical attention were selected through a combination of happenstance and interest. My initial interest in moments of encounter led me to focus on voyages to the northwest and northeast as case studies, but the close reading of the initial texts led me to question textuality and form in ways I had not considered starting out. In returning repeatedly to the text I also discovered narratives that had not piqued my interest initially, such as the Jonas text on Iceland. In each of these cases, the picture of the text I emerged with changed substantially, suggesting that while I am responsible as a kind of boundary of the text, the text projects itself on me continually and in different ways. Even after I felt as though I knew the text thoroughly there were new revelations each time I returned to the text.

When configuring the reader as the boundary of the text, left unfinished, at least in this project, is an ethics of reading. How does a reader responsibly investigate texts included in *Navigations*? If one thinks of the reading of a text in a Bergsonian way (77-132), how does the reader ethically represent the memory-image of the text they are left with? While this does lie beyond the scope of the present work, this work certainly opens the way for such a study. The multiplicity of texts and what I have come to call the hybrid quality of Hakluyt's text suggests as much about the mediation of texts as it does the nature of phenomena. To be sure, there are multiple texts, sources, forms and interests that lie behind each text in *Navigations*. But this multiplicity is a flaw that reflects a fundamental position on phenomenological and social reality. The multiplicity of textual forms, the moments of disagreement and outright contradiction, and the different angles of perception are not chipping off different pieces of a hidden authentic reality in some kaleidoscopic process of negative dialectics. Rather, the absence of an authentic in-itself reality is precisely what gives rise to multiple narrative forms, disagreement, and different angles of perception. I have shown how contemporary textual practice attempts to construct a history free from contradiction. This leads to a historical structure that looks to the structure of the editing process, a process itself that is imbued with meaning. *Navigations* contrarily presents a history that is at war with itself. It employs a wide variety of rhetorical strategies, and reflexively exposes its own contradictions and ideological interests. Through this the reader is implicated in the meaning. Suggesting that the reader is the final arbiter in the construction of meaning does not suggest that s/he is the only one. Rather, it is the recognition that the reader is a part of a complex and diverse process forever in flux, and forever flawed.

Works Cited

Acosta, Joseph De. *The Natural and Moral History of the Indies*. Trans. Edward Grimston. London: Val: Sims, 1608. *Early English Books Online.*

Alan, John L. "From Cabot to Cartier: The Early Exploration of Eastern North America 1497-1543." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 82, 3 (1992): 500-521.

Andersen, Jennifer Lotte, and Elizabeth Sauer, eds. *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002.

Anghiera, Pietro Martire d'. *De Orbe Novo: The Eight Decades of Peter Martyr*. Trans. and ed. Francis Augustus MacNutt. New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

Auger, Reginald. "Decentring the Icons of History: Exploring the Archaeology of the Frobisher Voyages and Early European-Inuit contact." Warkentin and Podruchny 262-286.

Bacon, Francis. *The New Organon*. Ed. Lisa Jardine and Michael Silverthorne. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

---. *The Major Works*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

Barnaby, Andrew, & Lisa J. Schnell, eds. *Literate Experience: The Work of Knowing in Seventeenth-century English Writing*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Beckett, Samuel. *Nowhow on, Three novels*. New York: Grove, 1996.

---. *Molloy, Molone Dies, The Unnamable*. New York and Toronto: Everyman-Knopf, 1997.

Benjamin, Walter. “The Work of Art in the age of Mechanical Reproduction.” *Illuminations*. Ed. and intro. Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, 1968: 217-251.

Bergson, Henri. *Matter and Memory*. Trans. Nancy Margaret Paul and W. Scott Palmer. New York: Zone, 1991.

Best, George. *A true discourse of the late voyages of discouerie, for the finding of a passage to Cathaya.* London: Henry Bynnyman,1578. *Early English Books Online*

Best, Michael. “From Book to Screen: A Window on Renaissance Electronic Texts,” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 1:2 (1995). http://www.humanities.ualberta.ca/emls/01-2/bestbook.html.

Blackburn, Bonnie, and Leofranc Holford-Strevens. *The Oxford Companion to the Year.* (Oxford, Oxford UP, 1999): 687.

Blum, J. *Lord and Peasant in Russia from the Ninth to the Nineteenth century*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1951.

Burke, Peter. “The Renaissance Dialogue.” *Journal for the Society of Renaissance Studies* 3 (1989): 1-12.

Camille, Michael. “Glossing the Flesh: Scopophilia and the Margins of the Medieval Book,” Greetham 245-268.

Campbell, Mary Baine. “Renaissance Voyage Literature and Ethnographic Pleasure: The Case of André Thevet,” *Studies in Travel Writing* 1 (1997): 9-42.

---. *Wonder and Science: Imagining Worlds in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.

Cartier, Jacques. *The Voyages of Jacques Cartier*. Trans. H.P. Biggar. Intro. Ramsay Cook. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1993.

Chartier, Roger. *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe Between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Trans. Lydia G. Cochrane. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

---. "Labourers and Voyagers: From Text to Reader." Finkelstein and McCleery 47-58.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Complete Poetry and Prose of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Ed. John H. Fisher. Philadelphia: Harcourt Brace, 1989.

Clucas, Stephen. "'A Knowledge Broken: Francis Bacon's Aphoristic Style and the Crisis of Scholastic and Humanist Knowledge-Systems." *English Renaissance Prose: History, Language, and Politics*. Ed. Neil Rhodes. Tempe AZ: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997. 147-172.

Cohen, Stephen. "Between Form and Culture: New Historicism and the Promise of a Historical Formalism." *Renaissance Literature and its Formal Engagements*. Ed. and intro. Mark David Rasmussen. NY: Palgrave, 2002. 17-41.

Coleridge, Samuel. *A Book I Value: Selected Marginalia.* ed. H.J. Jackson, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Collinson, Richard, ed. *The Three Voyages of Martin Frobisher: In Search of a Pasage to Cathaia and India by the North West, AD 1576-8, Reprinted from the First edition of Hakluyt's Voyages With Selections From Manuscript Documents in the British Museum and State Paper Office*. 1867. London: Hakluyt Society; New York: Burt Franklin, 1962.

Columbus, Christopher. *The Diary of Christopher Columbus's First Voyage to*

America, 1492-1493. Abstracted Bartolomé de las Casas. Trans. and annot. Oliver Dunn and James E. Kelly Jr. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1989.

Cormak, Bradin, and Carla Mazzio. *Book Use, Book Theory 1500 - 1700*. Chicago: University of Chicago Library, 2005.

Cribb, T.J. "Writing Up the Log: The Legacy of Hakluyt." *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Ed and intro. Steve Clark. London: Zed, 1999. 100-112.

Darnton, Robert. "What is the History of Books?" Finkelstein and McCleery. 9-26.

Dathorne, O.R. *Imagining the World: Mythical Belief Versus Reality in Global Encounters*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 1994.

Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.

---. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

Dew, Nicholas. "Reading Travels in the Culture of Curiosity" *Journal of Early Modern History* 10 (1-2) (2007): 38-59.

De Vorsey, Louis Jr. "Richard Hakluyt: Elizabethan Voice of Discovery" *Meridian* 14 (5) (1988): 5-12.

Eden, Richard. *The first three English Books on America, being chiefly translations, compilations &c. by Richard Eden from writings, maps, &c. of Pietro Martire, Sebastian Munster, Sebastian Cabot, with extracts, &c., from the works of other Spanish, Italian, and German writers of the time*. Ed. Edward Arber. Westminster: A. Constable, 1895.

---. *A treatyse of the newe India*. London: Edward Sutton, 1553. *Early English Books Online*

---. *The Decades of the Newe World*. London: Powell, 1555. *Early English Books Online*

Eowmianski, Henryk. "The Russian Peasantry" *Past and Present*. 26 (Nov 1963): 102-119.

Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia UP, 2002.

Ferrier, R.W. "The Terms and Conditions under which English Trade Was Transacted with Safavid Persia." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*: *University of London* 49.1 (1986): 48-66.

Finkelstein, David, and Alistair McCleery. *The Book History Reader*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in this Class*: *The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1980.

Fleischmann, Brigitte. "Uneasy Affinity: Strategies and Notions Behind the Old World-New World Analogies in some Early English Reports from America," *European Contributions to American Studies* 34 (1996): 119-130.

Freud, Sigmund. *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. James Strachey. The Penguin Freud Library. London: Penguin, 1962.

---. *Civilization, Society, and Religion*. Trans. James Strachey. The Penguin Freud Library London: Penguin, 1962.

Froude, James. Anthony. "England's Forgotten Worthies." *Westminster Review* 58 (1852) 185-88.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four essays*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

Fudge, Erica. "Calling Creatures By Their True Names: Bacon, The New Science and the Beast in Man." *At the Borders of the Human: Beasts, Bodies and Natural Philosophy in the Early Modern Period.* Ed. Ruth Gilbert and Susan Wiseman. New York: Palgrave, 2002. 91-109.

Fuller, Mary C. *Voyages in Print: English Travel to America, 1576-1624.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Grafton, Anthony. *New Worlds, Ancient Texts*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992.

---. *The Footnote: A Curious History*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.

---. *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.

Greetham, D.C., ed. *The Margins of the Text*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997.

---. "The Resistance to Philology," Greetham. 9-24.

Grekov, Boris Dmitrievich. *The Russian Peasantry From its Origins to the 18th Century.* 2 vols. Trans. Y. Sdobnikov. Kiev: 1959.

Hair, Paul. "Guinea." Quinn 197-207.

Hakluyt, Richard. *Divers Voyages Touching the Discovery of America and the Islands Adjacent by Richard Hakluyt*. 1582. New York: Burt Franklin, 1960.

---. *The Discourse on Western Planting*. Cambridge: Maine Historical Society, 1877.

---. *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation.* Intro. John Masefield. Ten Vols. London and Toronto. J.M. Dent, 1927.

---. *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation.* London: G. Bishop and R. Newberie, 1589.

---. *The Principall Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation.* 3 vols. London: George Bishop, Ralph Newberie, and Robert Barker, 1599-1600. *Early English Books Online.*

---. *The Original Writings and Correspondence of the two Richard Hakluyts; with an Introduction and Notes*. Ed. Eva Germaine Rimington. London: Hakluyt Society, 1935.

Hariot, Thomas. *A Briefe and True report of the new found land of Virginia.* Frankfurt am Main: Typis Ioannis Wecheli, sumtibus vero Theodori de Bry. Venales reperiuntur in officina Sigismundi Feirabendii, 1590. *Early English Books Online.*

Harrisse, Henry. *John Cabot, The Discoverer of North America and Sebastian, his Son: a Chapter of the Maritime History of England under the Tudors, 1496-1557*. New York: Argosy-Antiquarian, 1968.

---. *The discovery of North America: A Critical, Documentary, and Historic Investigation, with an Essay on the Early Cartography of the New World, Including Descriptions of two Hundred and Fifty Maps or Globes, Existing or Lost, Constructed before the year 1536.* London: H. Stevens; Paris: H. Welter, 1892.

---. "Did Cabot Return From His Second Voyage?" *The American Historical Review* 3. 3 (Apr. 1898): 449-455.

Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England.*

Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Holderness, Graham, Stanley E. Porter, and Carol Banks. "Biblebable." Murphy 154-176.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Ideologies of Theory: Essays 1971-1986 Volume 1: Situations of Theory*. Theory and history of Literature. Vol. 48. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1988.

Johns, Adrian. "The Book of Nature and the Nature of the Book." Finkelstein and McCleery. 59-77.

Jones, Terry. *Chaucer's Knight: The Portrait of a Medieval Mercenary*. London: Methuen, 1982.

Kerr, Robert. *A General History and Collection of Voyages and Travels*. 18 vols. Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1824.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book I: Freud's Papers of Technique 1953-1954.* Ed. Jacques Alain Miller. Trans. John Forrester. New York: Norton, 1975.

---. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book III: The Psychosis*. Ed. Jacques Alain Miller. Trans and annot. Russell Grigg, London: Routledge, 1993.

---. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book VII: 1959-1960: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Jacques Alain Miller. Trans. Dennis Porter. New York: Norton, 1986.

---. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Jacques Alain Miller. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1978.

---. *Encore: The seminar of Jacques Lacan XX: On Feminine Sexuality, the Limits of Love and Knowledge, 1972-1973*. Ed. Jacques-Alan Miller. Trans. Bruce Fink. New York: Norton, 1998.

---. *Ecrits*. Trans. Bruce Fink. New York: Norton, 2006.

Las Casas, Bartolomé. *A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*. Ed. and Trans. Nigel Griffin. Intro. Stephen Greenblatt. London: Penguin 1992.

Léry, Jean de. *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil.* Trans and Intro. Janet Whatley. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.

Lestringant, Frank. *Mapping the Renaissance World: The Geographical Imagination in the Age of Discovery*. Trans. David Fausett. Cambridge: Polity, 1991.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Time and the Other: An Essay on Exteriority*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1969.

Levine, Joseph. *The Autonomy of History: Truth and Method from Erasmus to Gibbon.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999.

Lipking, Lawrence. "The Marginal Gloss," *Critical Inquiry* (3.3 1977): 609-656.

Loades, David. *England's Maritime Empire: Seapower, Commerce, and Policy 1490-1690*. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000.

---. "Sebastian Cabot" (*c.*1481/2–1557)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4290, accessed 5 nov 2006]

(2004) n. pag. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Online.* Internet. 5 Nov. 2006.

(*c.*1481/2–1557)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 3 Oct 2007]

Mackenthun, Gesa. *Metaphors of Dispossession: American Beginnings and the*

Translation of Empire. Norman and London: U of Oklahoma P, 1997.

MacCanles, Michael. “From Derrida to Bacon and Beyond.” Sessions 25-46.

Mancall, Peter C. *Hakluyt's Promise: An Elizabethan's Obsession for an English America*. New Haven & London: Yale UP, 2007.

Marcus, Leah. *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlow, Milton*. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.

McDermott, James, ed. *The Third Voyage of Martin Frobisher to Baffin Island, 1578*. London: The Hakluyt Society, 2001.

---. “Michael Lok, Mercer and Merchant Adventurer.” *Meta Incognita: A Discourse of Discovery*. Ed. Thomas H.B. Symons. Hull, On: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1999.

McGann, Jerome. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1991.

McKenzie, Donald Francis. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. London: British Library, 1986.

More, Thomas. *Utopia*. Trans. Robert M. Adams. 1975. Norton; ed. George M. Logan and Robert Mass. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Morgan, E. Delmar, and C.H. Coote. *Early Voyages and Travels to Russia and Persia, by Anthony Jenkinson and other Englishmen. With some Account of the first Intercourse of the English with Russian and Central Asia by way of the Caspian Sea*. New York, B. Franklin, 1967.

Murphy, Andrew, ed. *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality*. Manchester and NY. Manchester UP, 2000.

Nauert, Charles G., Jr. *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*. Cambridge:

Cambridge UP, 1995.

Neville-Sington, Pamela. "'A Very Good Trumpet': Richard Hakluyt and the Politics of Overseas Expansion." *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England*. Ed. Cedric C Brown. New York : St Martins, 1997, 125-152.

nichol, bp. *The Martyrology Books 1& 2*. 1972 ed. Toronto: Coach House P, 2003.

Orgel, Steven. "Afterword: Records of Culture." Anderson and Sauer. 282-291.

Parks, George B. "Tudor Travel Literature: A Brief History." D.B. Quinn 97-132.

Parry, J.H. "Hakluyt's View of British History" D.B. Quinn 3-8.

Payne, Anthony. *Richard Hakluyt and his Books. An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*. London: Hakluyt Society, 1997.

---. "'Strange, remote, and farre distant Countreys': the travel books of Richard Hakluyt." *Journeys Through the Market: Travel, Travellers and the Book Trade*. Ed. Michael Harris, and Robin Myers. New Castle: Oak Knoll P, 1999, 1-37.

Pennington, L.E. "Secondary Works on Hakluyt and his Circle." D.B. Quinn 576-610.

Penrose, Boies. *Travel and Discovery in the Renaissance 1420-1620*. Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1963.

Pliny, The Elder. *Natural History*. Harris Rackham. Trans. London: Harvard UP, 1938.

Puga, Rogério Miguel. "The Presence of the 'Portugals' in Macao and Japan in Richard Hakluyt's Principal Navigations." *Bulletin of Portuguese/Japanese Studies*, (2002): 81-116.

Quinn, Alison. "The Editing of Hakluyt's Discourse of Western Planting; Papers Given at the Twenty-Eighth Annual Conference on Editorial Problems." *Critical Issues* *in Editing Exploration Texts*. Ed. Germaine Warkentin. U of Toronto P, 1995.

Quinn, D.B, ed. *The Hakluyt Handbook*. London: The Hakluyt Society, 1974.

---. "Hakluyt's Reputation." Quinn 133-154.

---, ed and annot. *The Voyages and Colonising Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert*. 2 vols. London: Hakluyt Society, 1940.

---. " John Cabot" (2004) n. pag. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Online*. Internet. 5 Nov. 2006.

Quinn, David. B., Allison. M. Quinn, and S. Hillier, eds. *New American World: a Documentary History of North America to 1612*. 2 vols. New York: Arno, 1979.

Quinn, David B and Allison M. Quinn, eds. *A Particular Discourse Concerninge the Greate Necessitie and Manifolde Commodyties that are like to Growe to this Realme of Englande by the Westerne Discoueries Lately Attempted, Written in the Yere 1584*. London: The Hakluyt Society, 1993.

Rasmussen, Mark David, ed. *Renaissance Literature and its Formal Engagements*. New York, NY : Palgrave, 2002.

Rhodes, Neil, and Jonathan Sawday, eds. *The Renaissance Computer: Knowledge Technology in the First Age of Print*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Roberts, Colin H, and T.C., Skeat. *The Birth of the Codex*. London: Oxford UP, 1987.

Robinson, Forrest G. Introduction. *An Apology for Poetry*. Philip Sidney. i - xxviii Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merill Company, Inc. 1970.

Rouse, Marty and Richard A. Rouse, "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of The Book." *Authentic Witness: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts*. (Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame

P, 1991) 115-141.

Rollins, Hyder E. “New Facts about George Turbervile.” *Modern Philology* 15. 9 (January 1918).

Rubiés, Joan-Pau. “Instructions for Travellers: Teaching the Eye to See.” *History and Anthropology* 9 2-3 (1996): 139-190.

Sacks, David Harris. “Richard Hakluyt's Navigations in time: History, Epic, and Empire.” *Modern Language Quarterly* 67.1 (March 2006). *Expanded Academic ASAP*. Thomson Gale. U OF A. 12 Dec. 2006 <http://find.galegroup.com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca

Schnell, Lisa J. *Literate Experience: The Work of Knowing in Seventeenth-Century English Writing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Sessions, William A., ed. *Francis Bacon's Legacy of Texts*. New York: AMS, 1990.

Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. Ed. Forrest G. Robinson. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merill Company, 1970.

Simmons, J.S.G. “Russia.” D.B. Quinn 161-167.

Skelton, R.A. “Sebastian Cabot.” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography 1000—1700*. 1966. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: U of Toronto P, 1979.

Slights, William. *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in Renaisance Books*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2001.

---. “The Edifying Margins of Renaissance English Books,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, 42. 4. (1989): 682-716.

Spinoza, Benedictus de. *Ethics*. Ed. and trans. George Henry Radcliffe Parkinson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Stallybrass, Peter. “Books and Scrolls: Navigating the Bible” Anderson and Sauer .42-73.

Steppat, Michael. “(Un)Editing and textual theory: positioning the reader” *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality*. Murphy. 73-91.

Strachan, M.F. “India.” D.B. Quinn 208-213.

Sweet, Timothy. “Economy, Ecology and Utopia in early modern Promotional Literature.” *American Literature* 71(3) (1999): 399-427.

Tennant, James Emercon. *Ceylon, an account of the Island*. 2 vols. London, Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1860.

True, David. “Cabot explorations in North America,” *Imago Mundi* 13 (1956): 11-25.

---. “Some early maps relating to Florida,” *Imago Mundi*. Vol 11 (1954): 73 -84.

Vickers, Brian. “Bacon's So-Called 'Utilitarianism': Sources and Influence.” *Francis Bacon*. Ed. Marta Fattori. Rome: Ateneo, 1984.

---. “The Myth of Bacon’s ‘Anti-Humanism.’” *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy*. Ed. Jill Kraye and M.W.F. Stone. London: Routledge, 2000.

---. “Rhetoric and Poetics,” Schmitt, et al. 715-745.

Warkentin, Germaine and Carolyn Podruchny, eds. *Decentring the Renaissance: Canada and Europe in Multidisciplinary Perspective, 1500-1700*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001.

Williamson, James Alexander. *The Cabot Voyages and Bristol: Discovery Under Henry VII*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962,

---. *The Ocean in English History*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1941.

Willian, Thomas Stuart. *The Muscovy Merchants of 1555*. Clifton, N.J.: A. M. Kelley, 1973.

---. *The Early History of the Russia Company, 1553-1603.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1956.

Witherspoon, Alexander M, and Frank J Warnke, eds. *Seventeenth-Century Prose and Poetry*. Second Ed. San Diego: HBJ, 1982.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Trans. D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness. 1974 ed. Atlantic Highlands NJ: Humanities P international, 1992.

Woolf, D.R. "Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England" *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40.1 (1987): 11-48.

---. *The Social Circulation of the Past*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

Worden, Blair. *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's Arcadia and Elizabethan Politics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Wright, Louis Booker. *Religion and Empire: The Alliance Between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion 1558-1625*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1943.